DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 147 354 TM 006 803

AUTHOR Tibby, Edward R.; Hirabayashi, Judith Bonnett
TITLE A Survey of Trends and Patterns in Collegiate Admission and Placement. A Focused Informational Report.
INSTITUTION Educational Testing Service, Berkeley, Calif.
PUB DATE Sep 77
NOTE 146p.; Portions of the questionnaire may not reproduce well due to marginal legibility of original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$7.35 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Policy; *Admission Criteria; Affirmative Action; *College Admission; College Bound Students; College Entrance Examinations; College Freshmen; *College Placement; Colleges; *Declining Enrollment; Educational Trends; English; Enrollment Projections; Essay Tests; Evaluation Methods; Grades (Scholastic); Higher Education; Mathematics; Minority Groups; Physically Handicapped; Private Colleges; Questionnaires; Student Recruitment; *Surveys; Tables (Data); Test Interpretation; Universities
IDENTIFIERS American College Testing Program; Scholastic Aptitude Test; Test of Standard Written English

ABSTRACT

A survey of 71 colleges showed relatively little change in recruitment, admissions, and placement policies or procedures despite commonly predicted declines in future enrollment. A similar questionnaire sent to ten regional executives tended to confirm this finding. The questionnaire responses showed wide variability in current practices. Few of the colleges anticipated declining enrollments, and 40 percent indicated that they planned to raise admissions standards. The responses indicated a moderate increase in the importance of high school records and of test scores and a slight decrease in the use of recommendations. No clear patterns were shown regarding recruitment of special applicants such as physically handicapped or members of ethnic minority groups. The results showed confusion over the appropriate use of the College Entrance Examination Board's Test of Standard Written English for placement decisions. High school grades were frequently cited as the criteria for decisions regarding placement in freshmen English and mathematics courses; however, there was an indication of greater use of essay tests. The questionnaires and tabulated results are appended. (CTM)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED147354

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

EDWARD R. TIBBY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

TM006 803

ED147354

A SURVEY OF TRENDS AND PATTERNS IN COLLEGIATE ADMISSION AND PLACEMENT

A Focused Informational Report

Edward R. Tibby
Judith Bonnett Hirabayashi

Berkeley Office
Educational Testing Service

September 1977

TM006 803

CONTENTS

Page

List of Tables A - G. 2

List of Tables 1 - 29. 3

Acknowledgments. 6

Abstract. 7

Introduction: 8

The Context. 8

References. 18

Procedures. 19

Clarification. 20

A Survey of Trends and Patterns in Collegiate Admission and Placement. 22

The "Big Picture" Supplement. 47

Summary. 58

Suggestions for Further Investigation. 62

Appendices:

Appendix A. List of Participating Institutions. 64

Appendix B. Survey Questionnaire. 70

Appendix C. "Big Picture" Questionnaire. 91

Tables:

Tables A-G. Comparative Profiles: Survey Sample vs. National Data. 96

Tables 1-29. (To accompany the "Survey of Trends and Patterns in Collegiate Admission and Placement" --see above). . . . . Separate Attachment

LIST OF TABLES A - G

Tables		Page
A	Number and percent distribution of responding institutions by control of institutions--compared to national profile of Fall 1975.	97
B	Number and percent distribution of responding institutions by highest level of offering and control of institution--compared to national profile of Fall 1975	98
C	Number and percent distribution of responding institutions by highest level of offering--compared to national profile of Fall 1975.	99
D	Number and percent distribution of responding institutions by region--compared to national profile of Fall 1975	100
E	Number and percent distribution of responding institutions by highest level of offering and region.	101
F	Number and percent distribution of United States institutions of higher education by highest level of offering and region, Fall 1975.	102
G	Percent distributions of responding institutions by size of enrollment and region--compared to national profile of 1976 . . .	103

LIST OF TABLES 1 - 29
(See separate attachment)

Tables — Page

1 Percent of institutions at which certain factors are required for admission ii

2 Percentage of institutions indicating a change in importance of various factors in admission decisions iii

3 Percentage of institutions indicating an overall change in admission standards iii

4 Percentage of institutions at which use is made of selected tests in admission decisions iv

5 Percentage of applicants for whom required test results are utilized in admission decisions--for institutions which require tests of all (or almost all) applicants for admission. iv

6 Percentage of applicants for whom results of specific required tests are utilized in admission decisions--for institutions which require tests of all (or almost all) applicants for admission . . . v

7 Percentage of institutions at which the use of specific tests in admission decisions has changed/is expected to change. vi

8 Percentage of institutions which accord certain types of students special consideration in admission decisions vi

9 Change in the percentage of institutions according certain students special consideration in admission decisions. vii

10 Percentage of institutions which have changed/will change their emphasis on various recruiting activities viii

11 Percentage of institutions which make a special effort to recruit certain types of students ix

12 Percentage of institutions which have changed/will change their efforts to recruit certain types of students. x

Tables — Page

13 Percentage of institutions at which the enrollment situation has prompted/is expected to prompt circular changes to varying extents xi

14 Percentage of institutions at which new programs and/or majors have been added/will be added to stimulate enrollment. . . xi

15 Percentage of institutions at which selection procedures have certain characteristics xii

16 Percentage of institutions at which selection procedures have changed/are expected to change xii

17 Percentage of institutions practicing certain application and notification procedures xiii

18 Percentage of institutions which indicate they have changed/will change the application period. xiii

19 Percentage of institutions at which placement standards for basic college-level courses have changed/are expected to change . xiv

20 Percentage of institutions at which certain factors are important in the placement of students in Freshman English classes? xiv

21 Percentage of institutions at which the importance of various factors in the placement of students in Freshman English classes has changed/is expected to change xv

22 Percentage of institutions at which certain factors are important in the placement of students in Freshman Math classes. xvi

23 Percentage of institutions at which the importance of various factors in the placement of students in Freshman Math classes has changed/is expected to change xvii

24 Percentage of institutions at which Freshman Math placement decisions are made by various people xviii

Tables | Page

25 Percentage of institutions at which Freshman English placement decisions are made by various people. xviii

26 Percentage of institutions at which a test of writing ability is required for the purposes of making English placement decisions? xix

27 Percentage of institutions at which different kinds of tests of writing ability are required. xix

28 Percentage of institutions for whom required test results are utilized in placement decisions xx

29 Percentage of institutions using statewide testing program results. xx

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to: Richard Peterson, for his advice in the development of survey instruments and his numerous and valuable editorial comments; Patricia Elias, for her editorial comments and her moral support; to Patricia Mannion, Ingrid Otten and Dee Ann Cuthbertson for their usual expert typing, their proofreading and their good humor; Margaret Burreson, Roy Hardy, Phil Harvey, Don Hood, Quentin Jones, Jean Reiss, and Ivor Thomas for their efficient bird-dogging; and, finally, to those inevitable persons who helped us but whom we have forgotten to mention.

ABSTRACT

The results of two small surveys of trends and patterns in admission and freshman-level placement in American higher education between 1970 and 1982 were reported. Current practices were also reported. The surveys included: (a) an extensive questionnaire which was returned by 71 two-year and four-year colleges and universities, representing a rough national cross-section; and (b) a "big picture" supplementary, open-ended questionnaire returned by ten persons adjudged to be in positions to see the situation in broad perspective. Results were tabulated and discussed.

INTRODUCTION

THE CONTEXT

Things are about to change in higher education. Of that there seems to be little doubt among the experts. While there is some debate about what lies beyond the top of the enrollment hill, all the king's data and all the king's men agree that we are at the crest of the hill, or maybe just beyond it.

Edward B. Fiske of the New York Times summed it up recently. "Higher education," he wrote, "has entered a period of no-growth and, in some cases, contraction." He summed it all up when he pointed out that two essentials are no longer in ready supply: dollars and students.

"By all odds, the dominant reality is the imminent prospect of fewer students," Fisk warned. "Because of declining birth rates, towns have closed elementary schools; by the mid-1980's the decline in the number of students will hit colleges in full force."

Fiske cited statistics from three northeastern states:

- The New York State Department of Education estimates that over the next decade the number of full-time undergraduate students in the state's 243 colleges and universities will decline from 534,000 to 485,000.

- Connecticut college enrollment dropped in 1976-77 for the first time in decades and is expected to be one-third less by 1992.

- New Jersey officials project a higher education enrollment decline from 244,000 to 216,000 by 1990.

Although the number of 18 to 22 year-olds is declining, many colleges see a good chance of filling some empty seats with "nontraditional" students. Fiske challenged this vision, warning that the adult market is near saturation. He quoted an official of the Connecticut Commission for Higher Education who warned that

adult students have a high "evaporation rate." "It looks like as many are dropping out as there are entering," he said.[1]

There are other data substantiating a peak in higher education. Jack Margarrell reported in the Chronicle of Higher Education that enrollment reports from virtually every college campus in the United States confirmed earlier estimates that for higher education 1976-77 was the first no-growth academic year since 1951. The National Center for Educational Statistics reported that total enrollment for fall 1976 was down 0.7 percent from the previous year. Compared with a final official figure of 11,290,719 students enrolled in fall 1975, the almost final total for fall 1976 (as of February 1977) was 11,215,111. These totals include full-time and part-time students, whether or not they enroll for credit toward a degree.

The historic turnabout had an unexpected prelude, according to Margarrell. "The end of 24 consecutive years of expansion was all the more dramatic--and for some institutions, traumatic--since it came immediately after a surprising surge of enrollment for all 1975. The 1975 total represented an increase of 9.4 percent over the previous year, the biggest one year rise in a decade," he said.

Even the experts can be off target. Margarrell pointed out that in the fall of 1975 NCES had estimated a 0.4 percent increase in enrollment for the fall of 1976. A 1.1 percent margin of error would not normally be embarrassing except that the difference between the estimate (up 0.4 percent) and the actual (down 0.7 percent) was magnified by the additional difference of direction.[2]

Slightly conflicting data was reported by Garland Parker, Executive Director of Enrollment Policy and Educational Research at the University of Cincinnati. Parker estimated in October of 1976 on the basis of limited data that total enrollment might have declined by 1 percent. Later, in February of 1977, he estimated the national enrollment decline in higher education at 0.1 percent.

While there is some dispute over the precision of various figures, there is consensus that enrollment was down slightly in 1976-77. More ominously, there is agreement that the situation will worsen. As Parker pointed out, "The 1976 decline provided an agonizing preview of what the implications may be for future losses."

Speaking before the National Association of College Admissions Counselors in October 1976, the highly respected Parker predicted

that the decline would progress slowly in the early 1980's, precipitously in the late 80's, and continue into the early 1990's. What this adds up to in his opinion, is a possible attrition of 20 to 25 percent by 1989. Parker tempered his forecast by adding that it assumed the present mix of students.[3]

Perhaps the most comprehensive and thoughtful analysis of the higher education enrollment decline was presented by Humphrey Doermann at a recent College Board Colloquium on College Admissions. Following are excerpts from his remarks:

> Following a century of expansion, higher education in the United States is about to enter at least a 15-year period of either no growth or shrinkage, depending on the projection assumptions one makes and upon the decisions made by federal and state governments concerning public policy in this sector. If public policy changed sufficiently, slow growth could continue. Meanwhile, the number of high school graduates each year will soon begin to shrink: 15 percent by 1984 and 22 percent by 1990....
>
> During the 100 years prior to 1970, degree enrollment in colleges in the United States doubled approximately every 14 or 15 years. During the 1950's and 1960's the rate of expansion was even faster. Never has there been a long period of enrollment decline. Brief declines occurred only during the two world wars, the Korean War and in 1933-34. Expectations, planning processes, federal and state budgeting mechanisms, and the administration of colleges and college systems have until recently all been built with an assumption of continued growth in enrollment. Some of these fundamental elements are still built that way, but for a time probably ought not to be....
>
> Once we move beyond the next 20 years, the traditional forces of growth may take hold again....
>
> But the period from now until the mid-1990's looks different. Of the many enrollment projections that have been made recently, only a few of them estimate enrollment growth, arguing that an expanding and sophisticated economy demands an expanding college sector regardless of the changing age structure in our society. Several other studies project relatively little change in total enrollment. These note that

since the number of high school graduates will decline during the next 20-year period, recruitment of adult students must make up the difference somehow. Finally, a few authors estimate total enrollment reductions by the year 2000 of as much as 33 percent. They reason from recent wage trends that the apparent economic return (in increased lifetime earnings) resulting from college attendance is declining. This loss of incentive, they believe, will cause a much smaller proportion of high school graduates to enter college during the next 20 years, until the education-intensive portion of the labor market once more becomes short of college graduates and until college degrees again begin to command a larger wage premium. Whether we believe the no-growth projections, the sharp-decline projections, or something in between, colleges appear to face a decade or two of unprecedented stress, competition, and perhaps retrenchment. This must happen unless fundamental changes occur that define in a different way who goes to college and why.

Doermann's paper, available in a CEEB publication, includes a number of fascinating tables.[4] The simplest, but perhaps most compelling data, are reported in the following table:

Projected Total Head-Count Enrollment in U. S. Colleges and Universities (1960-2000)

Year	Enrollment
1960	3,789,000
1970	8,581,000
1973	9,664,000
1980	11,513,000
1985	12,137,000
1990	11,818,000
1995	12,179,000
2000	12,794,000

Source: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching[5]

The latest projections of the American Council on Education, while focusing on the 18-year-old cohort group, are comparable:

High School and College Age Population
(As of October 1, 1976)

Year	Age 18
1973	4,090,000
1974	4,156,000
1975	4,193,000
1976	4,208,000
1977	4,236,000
1978	4,213,000
1979	4,135,000
1980	4,078,000
1981	4,015,000
1982	3,877,000
1983	3,691,000

Source: American Council on Education[6]

A number of implications emerge through the data and prognostications. Gene Maeroff of the New York Times sees a buyers' market already in effect. He cites the following evidence:

1. Colleges hiring management consulting firms to: (a) build their images; (b) recommend programs with appeal; and (c) take over recruiting;

2. A return of colleges to the formerly-maligned college nights and fairs;

3. Extensive advertising campaigns in the media;

4. The rising popularity of various student search services (According to Maeroff, almost half of all accredited four-year institutions subscribe to one or more such services.);

5. The College Board colloquium, and ensuing publication, devoted to the role of marketing in college admissions.[7]

At the CEEB colloquium Doermann discussed in some depth the possibility of colleges attracting different types of students. He suggested that for colleges seeking major new sources of students, two crucial factors are: (1) whether federal and state governments are willing to underwrite a new attempt to broaden access to post-secondary education, that is, to provide financial assistance for students who might benefit from college but do not now attend; and (2) whether part-time and other adult collegiate programs are financially feasible.[4]

There is some question whether many colleges are yet cognizant of the changes they may have to make. After a series of interviews with college administrators and faculty members, Edward Sanders concluded that there is "a disturbingly wide gulf in the current thinking about the appropriate standards of eligibility for postsecondary education. I think the faculty position is that open admission is all right somewhere--but not here."

Furthermore, Sanders sees a disconcerting gap developing between faculties and admissions staffs in a time calling for increasing cooperation and understanding. "The senior administrators and faculties of the majority of four-year colleges have abdicated their responsibilities for any detailed participation in their admissions policies and operations," he charges, adding, "This does not mean that they are not concerned about enrollment." "Their response," he says, "is simply to increase funds for recruiting."

"As the admissions function has become more important in college admissions," says Sanders, "most of its actual administrators have become further removed from the central controlling organization of the institutions. It is my impression that...fewer members of admissions staffs now have faculty status, that fewer serve on other major policy committees."

Sanders also found little utilization of students in admission activities. He wrote, "I am depressed at the apparent timidity, particularly of the independent and smaller colleges, about inviting students into full participation in the admissions operation. It is one of the administrative functions in which students are capable of making genuine contributions."[8]

As the market changes, Doermann sees new opportunities and severe new problems arising for the colleges. He believes that colleges will seek to broaden their effective pools of applicants in

familiar ways and in new ones. The resulting competition will, he feels, sometimes be healthy, sometimes not. He fears that if colleges can only manage to compete aggressively with each other for a larger share of a shrinking pool, the total system will be in disarray 15 years from now.

However, he is guardedly optimistic as he considers the nontraditional pool of applicants: untapped high school graduates, community college transfers, and adult students.

On untapped high school graduates:

> A different source of students for many colleges can be those recent high school graduates who are sufficiently able and interested to profit from postsecondary work but who, for financial and other reasons, ordinarily would not undertake it. Community colleges and others have successfully attracted such students. Federal and state student financial aid programs have helped change the plans of many others. The number of first-time entrants to two and four-year colleges in 1976 is about 60 percent as large as the number of high school graduates that year. If federal and state policy were to underwrite a stronger attempt to move toward universal access to postsecondary education, it might be reasonable to expect this proportion to rise to 70 percent within five to seven years, a shift of about 200,000 high school graduates from "not in college" to college-enrolled from each annual crop.

On two-year transfers:

> Four-year colleges also may attract additional students by recruiting transfer graduates from junior and community colleges, and in some cases from postsecondary vocational schools. The net gain to total U.S. college enrollments probably will not be large, since the proportion of two-year college graduates seeking further academic work is small. But the impact of such recruitment for selected colleges and groups of colleges can be substantial.

On adult students:

> Finally, the largest and at first glance the most obvious untapped market for college education is the adult market: individuals that might be served by full-time and part-time programs, whether or not these lead to the conventional degrees. The population base is large and expanding. An increasing desire for occupational retraining and for many kinds of nonvocational programs seems highly probable. However, whether these potential advantages can be converted into worthwhile new effective demand that at the same time will improve the health of colleges is not clear. Before this can occur, difficult issues of pricing, program design and public policy must be resolved.[4]

In such an atmosphere of vanishing dollars and students it is unfortunate, but apparently true, that the shortage of the former adds to the appearance of the latter. For example, in a six year national survey of large universities, William Sedlacek and Judy Clarke found that the emphasis given minority admissions has peaked and is now declining.[9] Minority students certainly must include a large segment of the untapped high school graduates to which Doermann referred.

Concern has been expressed in many quarters concerning the fate of the independent colleges in the perilous decade ahead. Certainly, some of them are particularly vulnerable. Others appear to be in good shape. There are some signs that the general condition of the independents is not as fragile as is commonly suspected. One favorable indicator was reported in the Chronicle of Higher Education recently by Jack Margarrell. He told of a study sponsored by the American Association of Colleges, financed by a grant from the Lilly Endowment, by John Minter and Howard Bowen. In a survey of 100 colleges, they found independent institutions were maintaining a competitive position in relation to the publics. While the differences in costs between private and public education has doubled (from $1,000 to $2,000) between 1966 and 1976, so has the family's ability to pay (on the basis of per capita income after taxes). Therefore, the tuition gap did not increase, argue the authors of the report.

Minter and Bowen do not deny the enormous growth of public higher education, but they reason that private education has held ground. In 1950, one-half of all college students were enrolled in independent institutions; in 1975, less than one-fourth of the students

were in the independents. Nonetheless, during the same period the independents more than doubled their enrollment--1.1 million students in 1950; 2.3 million in 1977. Furthermore, in 1950 the independent institutions enrolled 5.8 percent of the population between the ages of 15 and 24; in 1975 they enrolled 5.1 percent of the same age group. "What has happened," say Minter and Bowen, "has been an enormous expansion of public higher education, but no diminution of private higher education."

Minter and Bowen concede that the outlook is hardly one of sunshine and roses throughout the independent camp. They worry about the marginal campuses. Of 90 colleges which they examined, 13 were "financially weak" in 1975-76. Yet a year earlier, they placed only eight of 90 in the "weak category," indicating a slight change for the worse, on balance, for the private institutions.

Despite some indications of weakness among the independent colleges which they studied, Minter and Bowen gained respect for their adaptability. "In the three years we have conducted our studies," they commented, "not a single institution in our sample has disappeared. One of the reasons is that when institutions get in trouble, they take steps to correct their problem. The 'will to live' among colleges and universities is very strong."[10]

Others view the situation with more alarm, citing evidence that, among the independents the fat may be getting fatter and the lean may be getting leaner. In another Chronicle of Higher Education article, Margarrell reported the findings of a study of higher education enrollments from 1970 to 1975 by Joseph Fromkin, a Washington educational consultant. Fromkin found the tendency for the more selective colleges to gain enrollment and the less selective to lose enrollment to be stronger among private institutions than public ones. He concluded, "There is no evidence that institutions which have been losing enrollment are arresting their losses.... With further erosion of their student base, these institutions, especially in the private sector, will have to either institute draconian economics or close their doors."[11]

Among the many materials which were reviewed in relation to this focused report on trends in college admissions practices, several included information which seems germane to the roles of ETS and CEEB as we enter an era of flux in higher education. They were all gleaned from essentially in-house documents. Nonetheless, they bear reference in this context.

One such paper is what is commonly called the SERCI Report, a compendium of a comprehensive series of interviews with admissions officials conducted by the College Board in 1975. Three moderately strong measurement needs expressed by the admissions officers were: for placement testing; for separate norms for persons over 25 years of age; and for self-administered, self-scored instruments to assist adult students in self-assessment.[12]

A useful report was prepared by the ETS Department of Educational Relations in 1975. It was dubbed the "Collegiate Entry Level Testing Survey" and it was primarily concerned with placement testing practices at "open door-type" two-year and four-year public colleges.

The DER report did a good job of analyzing that segment of the collegiate market in terms of admission and placement practices and needs. One useful finding was that the decision-making process regarding test selection varies greatly from college to college. Any number of people can initiate and be involved in the decisions. However, department chairpersons almost always play the most influential role in the selection of placement tests.

The DER report noted the fragmented market for placement tests, observing three general placement testing patterns among the types of colleges surveyed: some go with off-the-shelf standardized tests; others prefer to use locally developed tests; while others use one of the available national programs.

Elaborating on the fragmented market, the DER summary of 102 field interviews commented on a "general lack of psychometric knowledge by college people who make decisons on tests." "Many colleges," the report said, "appear to be aware of the inadequacy of present methods used for placement, and are open to suggestion. However, they are discouraged by the complexities involved.... Quick cheap tests provide an easy out."[13] The CGP experience confirms this observation.

This, then, is the context within which the following study was conducted.

REFERENCES

1. Fiske, Edward B. Article in New York Times, March 13, 1977.

2. Margarrell, Jack. Article in Chronicle of Higher Education, February 22, 1977.

3. Parker, Garland. Presentation at National Association of College Admissions Counselors National Conference, Denver, Colorado, October, 1976.

4. Doermann, Humphrey. "The Future Market for College Education." A Role for Marketing in College Admissions. CEEB, 1976.

5. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. More Than Survival: Prospects for Higher Education in a Period of Uncertainty. Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, San Francisco, 1975.

6. A Fact Book on Higher Education. Second Issue. American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1976.

7. Maeroff, Gene. Article in New York Times, November 28, 1976.

8. Sanders, J. Edward. "The New Admissions Scene." The College Board Review, No. 87, Spring, 1973.

9. Sedlacek, William E., and Clarke, Judy P. Minority Admissions to Large Universities: A Six Year National Survey. Research Report No. 3-75, Cultural Study Center, Maryland University, College Park, Maryland, 1975.

10. Margarrell, Jack. Article in Chronicle of Higher Education, January 31, 1977.

11. Margarrell, Jack. Article in Chronicle of Higher Education. Undated.

12. "Survey of Entrance Responsibilities in Collegiate Institutions (SERCI)." CEEB, 1977.

13. Blocksma, Julia Ryan, Urbanowski, Frank, Vitella, Peter, Wolfe, Barbara Burgess, and Schoen, Walter T. "Collegiate Entry Level Testing Survey--Final Report," Department of Educational Relations, ETS and CEEB, 1975.

PROCEDURES

The survey consisted of two components: a structured questionnaire and a simplified "big picture" questionnaire.

The structured questionnaire/opinionnaire was field tested on a small cross-section of admissions directors and then sent to nine ETS regional offices and one CEEB regional office in the following areas: the Northwest, the Far West, the Southwest, the Rocky Mountain States, the Midwest, the Southeast, the Mid-Atlantic, and New England. Field representatives in the various regional offices were instructed to obtain responses from admissions officials representing the following structured sample of institutional types: two state universities (one designed as "old line," the other as "newly emerging"); two state colleges* (one old, one new); two community colleges (one serving an urban area, one serving a suburban and/or rural area); and three independent colleges, representing different levels of selectivity. (See Appendix B for a copy of the survey instrument.)

Thus, 90 questionnaires were sent to 90 collegiate admissions officials who had been telephoned in advance and agreed to complete them. Eventually, 71 usable questionnaires were returned in varying degrees of completion. Some items were completed by every respondent; others, apparently more troublesome, fared less well. Discrepant completion rates are noted in the tables. (See separate attachment containing Tables 1-29.)

The report which follows is drawn, then, from this rather rough, cross-cut sample of 71 institutions of higher education representing 30 states. (Appendix A provides a complete listing of participating institutions.)

The "Big Picture" supplementary questionnaire was conceived as a back-up, to hopefully add some breadth to the survey. We asked each of our regional "field elves" to identify one appropriate person in his or her region who occupies a position which affords a broader

---

* The assignment of some public institutions to the "state college" category was arbitrary, in several instances. Though a few institutions carry the name "university" it was a considered judgment that, for several reasons, they more appropriately should be categorized as state colleges for the purposes of this survey.

view of the admissions scene than that enjoyed by the typical campus admissions officer. We suggested such people as coordinators of multi-campus systems, state higher education officials, executive directors of appropriate professional organizations, directors of CEEB or ACT regional outposts, or just knowledgeable admissions people. Forms containing 13 open-ended items were sent to nine volunteer "biggies." All were returned. The results are reported in The "Big Picture" Supplement.

CLARIFICATION

The major flaw in this study, in our judgment, lies in the samples--both in the survey drawn from the structured instrument as well as the "big picture" supplement. We do not apologize for this. We just wish "to make it perfectly clear" that the sample is an insufficient basis for absolute generalizations. This does not necessarily invalidate any of our findings. It merely underscores the need for a more comprehensive, or at least a more carefully controlled, study.

There are several clues as to the less-than-ideal sampling of participating colleges in the structured survey. In the first place, there are discrepancies between our profile of institutions and various national profiles (See Tables A-G.) These differences are based on institutional variables. We lacked the resources to draw similar comparisons based on national student population variables, so we do not know how well our data matches up along that dimension. Better, we hope.

There also appears to be a bias in terms of a College Board alignment of participating institutions. Since we employed ETS and CEEB regional field representatives as contact people this was probably to be expected.

Finally, there is an obvious proximity of respondents to our field elves is evident. The sample includes colleges in 30 states. However, certain states dominate the sample--16 colleges are located in California, four in Texas, five in Oregon, five in Colorado, three in Georgia. The remaining 36 responding institutions are dispersed throughout 25 states.

Furthermore, the "big picture" sample is even less representative. It contains no input from the community colleges and state college sectors and is clearly dominated by the voice of the independents.

We attempted to point out, in a general way, the various limitations of the sample in the course of the narration. For anyone interested in a thorough analysis of the data, all the returned questionnaires and more detailed summary data will be retained in the Berkeley Office of ETS for a period of time and then sent to the ETS Archives in Princeton. RIP.

One final explanation: In the interest of brevity we use the word "college" in the generic sense.

NOTA BENE

The Tables for the main part of this report (the section called "A Survey of Trends and Patterns in Collegiate Admission and Placement") may be found in the separate attachment: "Tables 1-29--To Accompany A Survey of Trends and Patterns in Collegiate Admission and Placement."

A SURVEY OF TRENDS AND PATTERNS IN COLLEGIATE ADMISSION AND PLACEMENT

LINE OF INQUIRY: TRENDS IN ADMISSIONS STANDARDS

Question: Are various factors which figure in college admissions decisions changing in importance?

Reference: Tables 1 and 2. (Note: Tables 1-29 in separate attachment)

Findings:

GENERAL

Responses to the set of questions present a picture of little or no change in the relative importance of the various factors which typically bear on admissions decisions in a cross-section of American colleges. Table 1 data seem consistent with popular assumptions regarding the popularity of the different factors. Despite allegations of the devaluation of high school grades and hints of a resurgence of testing there is little evidence of such a trend.

HIGH SCHOOL RECORD

For example, in Table 2, 57 percent of the respondents reported no change since 1970 in importance of the high school record; 38 percent felt it had increased in importance; only 5 percent saw a decrease. If anything, the integrity of the high school record has been enhanced among our respondent institutions. Furthermore, little change in emphasis is expected in the future--62 percent anticipate no change in importance of the high school record in the college admissions process; 36 percent expect an increase; only two percent see it decreasing in importance.

TEST RESULTS

The relative importance of test results in college admission appears to remain virtually unchanged. Forty-five percent of the sample report no changes since 1970. While 31 percent have seen test results increase in importance during the same period, 24 percent feel they have decreased in significance. Looking ahead, a modest increase in emphasis on tests in college admission is projected--61 percent predict no change; 33 percent predict an increase; only five percent see a decrease.

NON-INTELLECTIVE FACTORS

The use and importance of the so-called nonintellective factors (recommendations, interviews, activity records, etc.) appear to be in a mild state of flux among a limited clientele--their use being confined to independent colleges. The number of institutions in this sample requiring such information is too small to draw conclusions, but an interesting contrast appears in regard to one factor: the recommendation. Whereas it is predicted that all other factors will show increases in importance within the next five years (especially extracurricular activities), a modest decrease in the use of recommendations is projected. Comments from respondents suggest that this is attributable to the Buckley Amendment. Nonetheless, "No Change" remains the modal response for all nonintellective factors--past and present.

Questions: How have admissions standards changed since 1970? How will they change through 1982?

Reference: Table 3

Findings:

TRENDS IN ADMISSIONS STANDARDS--GENERAL

The range of admissions standards shown was not unexpected. What was surprising was the pattern of projections. While 57 percent of the respondents indicated no important changes during the 1970's, 26 percent reported that they have raised their standards,

while 16 percent have moderately lowered theirs. Forecasting seemed generally at variance with national projections of declining enrollments beginning in 1978. Most colleges apparently assume it will affect other campuses. Only ten percent anticipate lowering standards, 47 percent expect to stand pat, while an incongruous 40 percent confidently, and perhaps unrealistically, plan to raise admissions standards.

TRENDS IN ADMISSIONS STANDARDS--BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

A breakdown by type of institution shows that expectations of the independent colleges are less sanguine. The bulk of the independent college respondents anticipate lowering admissions standards during the next five years. Most of the state universities and colleges in the sample inexplicably expect to moderately raise admissions standards. The community colleges see no changes. An interesting anomaly emerged among the private college responses. Among the 16 independent colleges which were classified as moderately-to-minimally selective, five expect to raise their standards moderately, two to raise them substantially. Perhaps they reason that they can best capture an increasing share of a decreasing market by upgrading their standards and images. Only three of these colleges expect to lower standards. By comparison, of seven colleges classified as highly selective only one expects to raise admission standards, four to stay as they are, two to lower them. It would seem that some of the less prestigious independent colleges are ignoring the handwriting on the wall of higher education.

LINE OF INQUIRY: TRENDS IN THE USE OF TESTS IN ADMISSIONS

Question: What tests are used in admissions decisions?

Reference: Table 4

Findings:

A PROBABLE SAMPLE BIAS

(N.B.: A sampling bias in terms of testing preferences of respondent institutions exists. Since responses were

arranged by seven ETS regional offices and one CEEB subregional office, the sample probably represents a pro-CEEB alignment since our intermediaries seem to have asked familiar people to respond to the questionnaire. Thus, summary data provide a profile of what is probably a slanted cross-section of American colleges, at least in terms of a CEEB--vis a vis--ACT orientation.)

PATTERNS OF TEST USE IN COLLEGE ADMISSION

Respondents were asked to tell which, if any, of the commonly available national tests (ACT, SAT, TSWE, ACH's) were used in admissions decisions at their institutions. The most popular response indicated that none of those tests are used for admissions purposes at their colleges--20 to 40 percent so answering, depending on type of institution. These were mostly community colleges and a few state colleges. The sample, as expected, showed a two-to-one ratio requiring SAT, 16 percent asking for ACT. Approximately 30 percent have an either/or requirement. A smaller number, about seven percent, recommend either. A similar number, approximately 10 percent, will use either test if submitted. The College Board Achievement Tests are required by 13 percent of the sample and will be used if submitted by another 22 percent. The CEEB newcomer, the TSWE, is, appropriately thus far, a minor factor in decisions to admit students to college, only four percent of our respondent colleges specifically requiring it.

Question: What proportion of the test results required by colleges are used in admission decisions?

References: Tables 5 and 6

Findings:

THE ALLEGED GAP BETWEEN TEST REQUIREMENT AND USE

The question was designed to determine the extent of any discrepancy between the requirement and utilization of required tests by some American colleges, a complaint frequently raised by counselors on behalf of

their students. The data lend a modicum of support to the allegation. (See Table 5.) Among colleges which do require tests for admission (76 percent of the total sample), a small majority (60 percent) say they regularly use the results of those tests in admission decisions; 15 percent say they use test results in one-quarter or less of the cases; finally, another 15 percent say they seldom, if ever, use test results. All but one of the actual or virtual non-users are public institutions --state universities, state colleges and community colleges being equally represented. Thus, at first glance it would appear that the counselors have a valid complaint. However, it must be pointed out that the question does not determine if other legitimate uses are made of test information (e.g., placement, institutional research). Another question pursued the use of required tests for placement purposes. The percentages of non-users and light-users were similar, which seemed to put a number of colleges in a bad light. However, a more careful examination of the data revealed otherwise. For a more thorough discussion, see the narrative pertaining to Table 28.

Question: How frequently are various required tests utilized in admissions decisions?

Reference: Table 6

Findings:

COMPARATIVE USE/NON-USE OF REQUIRED ADMISSION TESTS

Different patterns for different tests were indicated. The question was apparently irrelevant to 20 to 30 percent of the responding institutions--over half of the community colleges, one-third of the state universities and one-fourth of the state colleges indicating "N/A" in response to the item. Stated positively, among those respondents who do require the listed tests for admission, the SAT is not as un-used as ACT. This, of course, may well reflect a sampling bias. Only 20 percent of those

colleges requiring the SAT reported little or no use of the results, whereas 57 percent of the ACT-requiring colleges in the sample report a similar degree of non-use.

POSSIBLE INAPPROPRIATE USE OF THE TSWE

Responses concerning the TSWE provided a surprise. One-quarter of the respondents indicated utilization of that test in decisions to admit students. Since the new TSWE has been clearly billed as a test to be used experimentally for placement purposes, it may be being used inappropriately by some colleges. Other data also suggest that the TSWE's raison d'etre needs to be blazoned across the land. (See Table 20 and the discussion on trends in the use of tests in placement, page 17.)

Questions: What changes have occurred in the use of the more common tests in admissions decisions since 1970? What changes are foreseen through 1982?

Reference: Table 7

Findings:

CHANGES IN USE OF COMMONLY REQUIRED ADMISSION TESTS

A moderate trend in increased usage of the various national tests since 1970 was shown. The same level of use of the various tests through 1982 is anticipated. Three-fourths of the sample have seen and foresee little or no change. Reported and predicted increases run in the 20 or 25 percent range. Some decrease (18 percent) in use of the CEEB Achievement Tests since 1970 has been reported. A general decrease in admissions tests is not predicted although a slight lessening of test use by state universities and colleges was seen. In summary, no major changes in admission testing requirements has occurred nor is expected to occur. However, it should be emphasized that the total sample size is small and the number of responses regarding specific tests was even smaller--approximate-

ly three-fourths responding to ACT and/or SAT options and only one-fourth to ACH and TSWE choices. It is assumed that the N/R responses signify non-use of these tests.

LINE OF INQUIRY: TRENDS IN "SPECIAL CONSIDERATION" ADMISSIONS PRACTICES

Question: What types of students are accorded special consideration in admission decisions?

References: Table 8 and 9

Findings:

A MATTER OF SEMANTICS

The questions were difficult to frame. The problem was finding the most appropriate term to best describe the students in question since we learned that the same words have different meanings at different colleges. It was finally decided that "special consideration" was the broadest term to describe anything different or extra which occurred in admitting certain types of applicants. We weren't interested in recruiting practices or supporting services.

A CAVEAT

Our uncertainty was apparently shared by many respondents as only 42 percent answered the set of questions. The abstention rate on some alternative responses was as high as 80 percent. We assume that some of the questions either confused some of the respondents or that they simply were not applicable. Or both. As one respondent said, "We like to think that all applicants receive special consideration." In any event, these data should be viewed with particular caution.

SPECIAL CONSIDERATION FOR SPECIAL CATEGORIES OF APPLICANTS

Many of those institutions who did respond disclaim treating certain categories of applicants differently in making admission decisions (See Table 8). Half said they currently accord special consideration to "minorities." (We did not define the word.) One-quarter to one-third acknowledged special consideration

to athletes, foreign students, the handicapped, older persons, veterans and those without high school diplomas.

TRENDS IN SPECIAL ACTION ADMISSION DECISIONS

Among a variable number of respondents, a significant majority (roughly 60 to 80 percent) reported no recent changes of import in special admits for most of the aforementioned special categories of candidates. However, sizeable numbers did report increases in such activities since 1970--ranging from about one college in five for athletes, nonresidents and persons without high school diplomas; to one-in-three for minorities and foreign students; to two-in-five for the handicapped; to three-in-five for older persons and veterans. No sweeping changes are foreseen although additional attention to the handicapped, minority and older applicants is indicated. The only anticipated drop is for veterans. This suggests that the question was misunderstood--numbers being confused with types of applicants.

LINE OF INQUIRY: TRENDS IN RECRUITING ACTIVITIES

Question: What changes in recruiting activities are occurring?

Reference: Table 10

Findings:

CHANGES IN RECRUITING ACTIVITIES

Definite increases in certain recruiting activities are occurring and will continue to occur, according to our sample. Moderation is apparently the watchword in other activities. Since 1970 approximately one-half to two-thirds of the respondents report stepping-up: school visits; participation in college fairs/nights; use of faculty, students and alumni; and advertising via the media. One-fourth to one half of the colleges are holding steady in these things. Very few report a lessening of any recruiting activities. Reports of increased recruitment ran across all segments of higher education--less commonly among the highly selective independents; a little more among community colleges; more still among the four-year publics, who showed a

marked interest in school visits, participation in college fairs/nights and utilization of faculty. The less selective independents showed a similar pattern except for a greater propensity to supplement other activities with commercial advertising.

USE OF SEARCH SERVICES

A related sub-question was intended to provide information regarding the use of student search services. The data are confused (suggesting a confusing item), but they do show that about half of the sample employ the College Board and National Merit services, one-third use NSFNSS and one-fourth subscribe to ACT. (Again, we must call attention to the probable pro-CEEB bias in the sample.) It seems likely that a number of responding institutions use two or more of the various services although this can't be determined from our data. No use was reported by the sampled community colleges; light use by state universities; somewhat more by state colleges; the greatest use by the independents, particularly those classified as less selective --as would be expected.

FUTURE CHANGES IN RECRUITING ACTIVITIES

Looking ahead, in spite of projected annual decreases in applicant pools, no radical departures in the type or intensity of recruiting practices are envisioned. Slight decreases in alumni involvement and college fair/night participation are planned. Curtailment of the latter may represent wishful thinking since high schools, representing the "buyers" (i.e., the students) in an increasing buyers' market, seem determined to revive the once-moribund practice. It appears that the use of student search services will continue at the present rate.

Question: What types of students are the subjects of special recruiting efforts?

References: Tables 11 and 12

Findings:

RECRUITING OF CERTAIN TYPES OF STUDENTS

It would appear that no single type of "special" student (other than the unmentioned wealthy, gifted gem) is universally sought. (See Table 11.) The most popular among the types specifically asked about were minorities (sans definition), but only 51 percent of the respondents indicated them as special targets. Other categories of students and indicated degree of special recruitment: older students, 33 percent; veterans, 29 percent; women for certain fields (math, engineering, etc.), 26 percent; occupational groups (nursing, law enforcement, etc.), 20 percent. Foreign students were recruited by only seven percent of the sample.

RECRUITING PATTERNS AMONG TYPES OF COLLEGES

Recruiting patterns among the different segments of higher education were revealing. Almost all of the most selective independent colleges actively recruit minority students; about half are interested in women for heretofore nontraditional fields; few expressed much interest in any of the other types of students. Only one-third of the less selective independents are actively seeking minority students, probably because of problems in providing adequate financial aid. These small colleges showed only slightly more interest in the other categories of students. The four-year public institutions show evidence of more interest in special types of students--especially minorities, older students, vets and women for heretofore nontraditional fields. The sampled community colleges report little targeted recruiting of any sort. The general disinterest in recruiting foreign students seems to run across most colleges.

PROJECTED CHANGES IN RECRUITING ACTIVITIES

Despite national projections of a 15 percent decrease in the 18-year old cohort groups over the next five years, few colleges cite plans to fish harder in other pools--at least those suggested in the questionnaire. (See Table 12.) Given that activity levels are already reasonably high in most areas, most colleges do not plan additional efforts.

LINE OF INQUIRY: CHANGES IN CURRICULUM INFLUENCED BY ENROLLMENT

Question: To what extent has the enrollment situation prompted curricular changes?

References: Tables 13 and 14

Findings:

EFFECT OF ENROLLMENT ON CURRICULUM

The changing enrollment situation (presumably declining in most institutions) appears to have had a demonstrable effect on collegiate curricula. Six percent of the sample say enrollment has not influenced curriculum in their institution since 1970; only three percent feel that will not be the case by 1982. While none feel enrollment has influenced curriculum to a great extent since 1970, 23 percent expect to see such an effect by 1982. If our sample is indicative it would appear that nine out of every ten American colleges will revise their curriculum to some extent in order to attract students--a manifestation of the law of supply and demand. As might be expected, the more selective colleges are the least changeable. All other segments see curricular revision as one way of bolstering sagging enrollment.

LINE OF INQUIRY: TRENDS IN SELECTION PROCEDURES

Question: What changes are occurring in selection procedures?

References: Tables 15 and 16

Findings:

STATUS MOSTLY QUO IN SELECTION PROCEDURES

Respondents were asked to check activities which characterize current selection procedures. No more than 40 percent checked any response. This might say that the options (faculty involvement, student involvement, lottery system, open admission policy)

are not applicable to most of the sampled colleges. It also could suggest that few changes in selection procedures are occurring in most colleges. The latter suggestion is supported by the available data. A large majority of the colleges who did respond to the item chose "No Change" as the best descriptor of their stance on the various selection procedures. A sizeable minority did indicate an increasing role for faculty in student selection. A smaller number reported increases in student involvement. The small but growing number of students and faculty participating in selection procedures seems to be common not only in independent colleges, which was not surprising, but also in four-year public institutions, which was.

LINE OF INQUIRY: TRENDS IN APPLICATION AND NOTIFICATION PROCEDURES

Question: What is happening with some commonly practiced admission procedures?

Reference: Table 17

Findings:

ROLLING ADMISSIONS

The only popular choice among several options was rolling admission--71 percent of the respondents acknowledging that they attempt to render admit/reject decisions as students apply and not during a designated period. The practice increased moderately since 1970. Surprisingly, in view of an anticipated tougher market, no colleges not currently "rolling it" say they plan to commence doing so within the next half decade. Rolling admission is practiced by almost all of the state colleges and universities and well over half of the community colleges in the sample. A clear dichotomy appeared among the independents--all of the more selective colleges eschewing rolling admission but almost all of the rest doing it. Our subjective assignment of the independent colleges in the sample into

categories of "highly selective" and "others" showed a high degree of congruence with their self-reported use of rolling admission. Eschewal of rolling admission just might be a "quick and dirty" index of selectivity.

EARLY DECISIONS

Offering candidates early decisions regarding their acceptance or rejection before the specified notification period is a practice at 48 percent of the sampled colleges. (A possibility of respondents confusing the practice of early decision with the practice of rolling admission exists, so the data should be interpreted accordingly.) Well over half of the independent colleges --especially the less selective schools--offer early decisions, whereas well under half of the four-year publics offer the service. It is apparently an alien concept among the junior colleges. There is no evidence of the concept of early decision growing in popularity within the next five years.

COMMON CANDIDATE REPLY DATE

A common candidate's reply date is subscribed to by almost all of the highly selective independents, about one-third of the other independents, one-fourth of the state universities (assuming they understand the question), only two state colleges (same comment) and no community colleges.

Question: Are application periods changing?

Reference: Table 18

Findings:

EXPANSION OF APPLICATION PERIODS

One-quarter of the respondents report having extended the opening dates for applications since 1970. Reports of this change were almost equally divided among the less selective independents and the two-year and four-year publics. Another 12 percent of the sample,

in similar proportions, anticipate earlier application acceptances by 1982. A question concerned with extensions of application deadlines produced a similar number and pattern of responses. Apparently, then, an increasing minority of all colleges, except the prestige independents, are moving towards flexibility in application periods.

LINE OF INQUIRY: TRENDS IN PLACEMENT STANDARDS

Question: Are placement standards in English and mathematics changing?

Reference: Table 19

Findings:

CHANGES IN ENGLISH AND MATHEMATICS PLACEMENT STANDARDS

A definite elevation of placement standards in English and mathematics was reported. Virtually half of the respondents indicated moderate to substantial raising of English placement standards; 38 percent reported similar changes in math. Expectations are for more of the same, with 57 percent and 44 percent predicting standard raising to continue in English and math, respectively, through 1982. It should be pointed out, however, that a substantial number of colleges neither reported nor anticipated changes in placement standards. Then there are the inevitable mavericks, the five percent or so who report lowering freshman English and math placement standards. The "mavericks" do not run according to type, we found. They constitute a pretty good cross-section on the total sample.

LINE OF INQUIRY: TRENDS IN THE USE OF TESTS IN PLACEMENT

Question: What is the relative importance of high school grades and test scores in English placement?

Reference: Table 20

Findings:

APPARENT LACK OF COMMON FACTORS

Although the item seems straightforward, a response rate of 68 percent raises a subordinate question: Is it possible that 30 percent of our colleges use neither tests nor high school grades in determining appropriate levels of placement in freshman English courses? If this is true, then it is difficult to identify any common factor in placement in these basic subjects since neither high school GPA, high school English grades, nor any of the national testing programs, nor locally developed tests appear to be dominant factors.

VARIATION IN ACCEPTANCE OF HIGH SCHOOL GRADES

It seems reasonable to infer from the data that high school grades lack credibility with some college English departments, although there is considerable variation. Almost half of the respondent colleges indicated that the high school GPA is not used or unimportant in English placement determinations. Over one-third gave the same response in reference to high school English grades. It should be pointed out that over one-fourth of those who did respond to the question find the high school English grades to be very important for placement purposes. According to the survey, the ratio of some use vs. non-use of high school English grades in college placement runs about two to one.

USE OF HIGH SCHOOL GRADES BY TYPE OF COLLEGE

The pattern of use of high school grades as an indicator of college English performance is fairly consistent among most of the higher education segments in our sample. About half of all types use high school grades, except for the less selective independents; only one of four of the doughty private colleges see fit to use high school grades. Since these are all relatively small colleges perhaps such an attitude is a function of size.

USE OF TESTS IN ENGLISH PLACEMENT

The rate of response regarding use of tests in English placement was even lower than that regarding high school grades; thus, generalizations are even more tenuous. One explanation could be that some colleges don't offer a range of introductory English classes. Another is that some do not engage in placement. This bears further investigation. Be that as it may, there is evidence of great variation in colleges'

employment of tests for English placement. Some institutions seem to rely on them more heavily than on previous grades, others much less, or some not even at all. The determining factor could be institutional, or departmental, attitudes towards testing. The use of local tests seems to be the most popular practice, some 70 percent of the respondents indicating that home-made instruments play some role in English placement. The various tests available through CEEB or ACT were deemed very important placement tools in a significant minority of the sample colleges but are not used at all for that purpose in more than half of the sample.

EVIDENCE OF INAPPROPRIATE USE OF SAT, LACK OF RECOGNITION OF TSWE

An irony emerged from the data on patterns of test use. The more suitable achievement tests (ACT, TSWE and ECT) apparently enjoy less use in placement decisions than the more commonly used, but less appropriate, SAT. The disparity in numbers of colleges reporting use of the TSWE, as opposed to the SAT, raises questions either regarding general collegiate awareness of, or confidence in, the TSWE, which is now a junior partner in the SAT package. It would seem that the CEEB has a job yet remaining in educating its member colleges on the virtues of the TSWE.

PLACEMENT TEST USE BY TYPE OF COLLEGE

Spotting patterns of use, or non-use, among the different segments of higher education is difficult because of small numbers. A distinction among the general independent colleges does emerge, however. They seem to be particularly strong proponents of local testing for placement purposes. Chalk-up another point for rugged individualism.

Question: What changes are occurring in the use of high school grades and tests in English placement?

Reference: Table 21

Findings:

TESTS, HIGH SCHOOL GRADES AND ENGLISH PLACEMENT SINCE 1970

Again, a less than ideal (66 percent) response rate among an already small sample weakens the results. However, two-thirds of those who did respond to the question reported no change in use of high school GPA for English placement. The remaining one-third were equally divided between choices of more or less important since 1970. The pattern was somewhat similar in reference to high school English grades: two-thirds indicating no change; however, the majority of the remainder indicated that they had become more important. There was no evidence of a subordination of high school grades to tests in the English placement pecking order, as some testing proponents have speculated. The majority reported no change in the importance of testing; one-quarter see them increasing in importance. Very few indicated a lessening of the importance of tests for English placement.

ROLE OF GRADES AND TESTS THRU 1982

The reports of the past half decade proved to be the prophesies for the next half decade, with one small--and, therefore, questionable--exception. The projected increase in importance of the ECT is in marked contrast to others. We wonder: Is the venerable ECT about to enjoy a modest revival?

SUMMARY

In summary, there is no evidence of a large scale erosion of confidence in high school grades by college English departments. At the same time, there is evidence of a modest increase in reliance on tests for English placement.

Question: What is the importance of high school grades and test scores in mathematics placement?

Reference: Table 22

Findings:

CAVEATS

Once again, a reminder is in order regarding the probable alignment of an inordinate number of CEEB

colleges among the sampled institutions. Also, a response rate of less than 70 percent on the item must be acknowledged. This might mean that as many as 30 percent of the sample simply don't engage in such placement - a tentatively important finding in itself.

USE OF HIGH SCHOOL GRADES IN MATH PLACEMENT

The picture in math placement somewhat parallels that in English but there is a discernable difference in acceptance of high school grades. There seems to be less of a credibility gap in math. For example, 51 percent of the respondents said they feel math grades are of some importance; 28 percent said they are very important. Hence, 79 percent are using high school math grades in making placement decisions. This compares with 64 percent making similar use of English grades.

USE OF HSGPA IN MATH PLACEMENT

The same situation, to a lesser degree, prevails in reference to the importance of the high school GPA. The rate of some acceptance for math placement was 60 percent; for English, 51 percent. College math instructors apparently have more confidence in the high school record than their colleagues in the English departments.

USE OF TESTS IN MATH PLACEMENT

The pattern of test use and non-use in math among the respondent institutions is similar to that in English. One problem with the item is that it doesn't provide information about how many of the sample use some test. Again, local tests seem to be quite popular among a small number (28) of respondents.

EVIDENCE OF INAPPROPRIATE USE OF TESTS

There is some indication of inadvisable use of the several ATP mathematics tests, as shown by the fact that the SAT-M, by definition an aptitude test, enjoys a fairly good reputation as a placement aid among a certain number of colleges--71 percent of 38 colleges saying that it is either very important or of some importance in placing their freshman math students. By comparison, the ultimate math placement weapons in the CEEB arsenal, the Level I and Level II Achievement Tests, were reported as not used or unimportant in math placement decisions in 52 percent of 29 colleges. Many colleges do not require ACH tests, of course, and, for them, the SAT is an understandable expedient as a math

placement tool. It is certainly better than nothing. Nonetheless, the college placement data again present us with some evidence of the wrong test being used more and the right test being used less. There seems to be a message here for CEEB and ETS.

Question: What changes are occurring in the use of tests and high school grades in mathematics placement?

Reference: Table 23

Findings:

TESTS, HIGH SCHOOL GRADES AND MATH PLACEMENT SINCE 1970

Roughly two-thirds of the respondents (again remembering the less than 70 percent response rate) reported no change since 1970 in use of high school records and test score for purposes of placement in college math. Most of the remaining one-third indicated increased importance of grades and tests. An exception was local tests--almost half said they are more important now than in 1970. The increase in in-hours testing may be suggestive of a dissatisfaction with standardized tests. As was the case in English, there is no strong evidence of an erosion of confidence in high school grades, less than 10 percent saying they are less important today than they were seven years ago.

ROLE OF TESTS AND GRADES THRU 1982

The "Between now and 1982" section of the table is almost identical with the "Since 1970" side of the table. No dramatic changes in math placement practices are envisioned by our respondents. The same small ripple occurs in the math pond that we observed in the English tarn: a modest but significant increase in the role of the CEEB Achievement Tests is projected by a few respondents. The number is too small to warrant revisions of CEEB plans but the hint of a reverse in the decline in ACH volume is a welcome straw in the wind. Perhaps the clearest message in the generally static forecast on the math placement horizon is the continued

reliance of a sizeable number of colleges on local tests. Do-it-yourself testing, with all its charms and inadequacies, is apparently here to stay.

Question: Who makes English and mathematics placement decisions?

References: Tables 24 and 25

Findings:

MATHEMATICS PLACEMENT DECISIONS

It is clear that math departments make most placement decisions, at least among sampled institutions, where 79 percent said that's the way it is. (See Table 24.) This is up ten percent since 1970, suggesting a mild reassertion of departmental control during the era of inflated grades and deflated test scores. There is some delegation of decision-making responsibility to advisors, counselors and students in less than one-fifth of the respondents. No changes are projected. The pattern is the same in all types of institutions except for community colleges, where math faculty and counselors share the responsibility equally. It is assumed that placement policy is always established at department level, possibly with advice of counselors and/or testing officers.

NO FRESHMAN ENGLISH REQUIREMENT?

Whereas we took it for granted that math is not a freshman requirement at most colleges, we assumed that English is usually required. To check the latter assumption we specifically asked the question and found, to our surprise, that 15 colleges--21 percent of our sample--have no freshman English requirement. This proved true of an unlikely set of bedfellows: half of the highly selective independents and one-quarter of the community colleges. The former did not surprise us; the latter did. The most logical explanation we could imagine is that there are no English requirements for certain non-degree occupational-technical programs

in some community colleges. About one in eight of the other types of colleges disclaim a first-year English requirement (or misunderstood the question).

ENGLISH PLACEMENT DECISIONS

Among those sampled colleges with freshman English requirements the picture is quite analogous to the situation in math. (See Table 25.) There is some sharing of placement decisions with advisors (22 percent) but counselors and students are involved in less than ten percent of the colleges. This pattern is common in all types of colleges except community colleges, where counselors have a larger piece of the action. We took note of the 20 percent increase in departmental control over placement decisions since the turn of the decade. All of which suggests that the English profs are even more in command of the placement situation than the math mentors. The renewed desire for direct evidence of writing ability may account for greater involvement of the linguists. As was the case in math, there is no evidence of any big changes ahead during the next five years. A few respondents see some relaxation of departmental control over the placement decision-making apparatus.

Question: How much are direct and indirect measures of writing ability used in English placement?

References: Tables 26 and 27

Findings:

RELATIVE USE OF ESSAYS VS. OBJECTIVE TESTS

We were interested in obtaining some sense of the popularity of writing samples versus objective tests of writing ability as placement tools in American colleges. Based on a response rate of almost 80 percent we found that there are difinite indications of a movement towards direct writing measures. Of the respondents, only 29 percent said they had required a direct test of writing ability in 1970 whereas 55 percent say they now have

such a requirement. (See Table 26.) The trend may have leveled out, as only two additional colleges anticipate adding a writing requirement by 1982.

A JOINING OF THE WATERS

While the essay test has increased in popularity (at least with English faculties), the customary heavy duty role of the multiple choice writing test has not diminished. (See Table 27.) The trend is towards requiring both indirect and direct assessment in combination. Among those colleges that reported requiring some measure of writing ability, the sole use of an essay increased from 22 percent in 1970 to 33 percent in 1976-77 but is expected to drop back to 21 percent by 1982. The respondents, mostly admissions officers, may feel that the English teachers will eventually become fatigued reading placement essays or finally enlightened by the facts of life regarding the merits of indirect writing measures, or both. Even so, they (the admissions officials) do not anticipate a concomitant increase in the use of objective tests.

THE ENDLESS SEARCH

The answer doesn't necessarily lie in combining direct and indirect measures. The past, present and future use of the combination option was indicated at 61 percent, 50 percent and 65 percent, respectively. This pattern is consistent among all college types; all of which may support the observation of some college watchers that many English departments are caught in a circular, never-ending search for the ideal placement device, which, of course, doesn't exist.

The upsurge of interest in direct measures of writing skills does suggest a clear and present measurement need which ETS could serve in several ways: one, instrumentation in the image of the redoubtable STEP I Essay Test; two, promulgation of how-to-do-it-yourself guidelines as pioneered by Paul Diederich, Fred Godshalk, Evans Alloway and others; three, consultation; four, all of the above.

Question: What proportion of required test results are used in placement decisions?

Reference: Table 28

Findings:

ALLEGED TEST REQUIREMENT-USE GAP--SECOND VERSE

This question and answer bear on a previous pair of questions (See Table 6.) in which the relative use of required tests in admission decisions was investigated. The findings strongly implied that a number of colleges, mostly public, not use required tests for admission purposes. From this information a logical question ensued: Are they then perhaps used for placement purposes? This led to the item reported in Table 28. At first glance the results were suspiciously similar: 30 percent of the respondents signifying their use of required tests for placement purposes in one-fourth or less of their cases. At this point we were inclined to accept the off-heard complaints by high school counselors that some public colleges are exacting needless testing requirements on student applicants. However, after cross-checking the completed survey instruments we found that the counselor's allegations--and our suspicions --were largely without grounds, at least for our sample. While 23 institutions did report using tests one-fourth of the time or less for admissions or placement purposes, only four colleges reported using test results that infrequently for neither purpose. These included three state universities and one state college. In any event, the matter requires further study.

REQUIRED PLACEMENT TESTS IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

A curious split was shown among community college respondents on the use of required placement tests. About half gave a "N/A" response while most of the rest of the two-year colleges indicated that they use them extensively. Apparently it's all or nothing in placement testing with the community colleges.

LINE OF INQUIRY: IMPACT OF STATEWIDE TESTING PROGRAMS ON COLLEGE ADMISSION AND PLACEMENT

Question: What is the extent of collegiate use of statewide testing program results?

Reference: Table 29

Findings:

EFFECTS OF STATEWIDE TESTING PROGRAMS

According to the findings of this survey, which contacted colleges in 30 states, the effects of statewide testing programs on college admission and placement practices have been and will continue to be negligible. Only six institutions report currently using state testing program results. These included a state university in Virginia, a junior college in Florida, an independent university in Oregon, and an independent college in Washington. Among the 30 states surveyed only three --Washington, Virginia and Florida--appear to have state testing programs which bear on college admission and placement. Arkansas and New Jersey report "possibilities."

LINE OF INQUIRY: SUGGESTIONS TO ETS REGARDING NEEDED TESTS OR SERVICES

A CIPHER OF SUGGESTIONS

The survey questionnaire, otherwise structured, concluded with an open-ended question which asked, "Do you have any suggestions for new or improved tests, other assessment measures, or other services which ETS might improve which would be helpful to institutions like yours in the 1980's?" The response was underwhelming. Perhaps the intrepid 71 respondents, to whom we are most grateful, were too fatigued after completing the 19-page, 46-item questionnaire to give much thought to what ETS could do for them. Or perhaps they were too busy to give much thought to the question. It did reach them at a bad time of year. Whatever the reasons,

there were not enough responses to warrant any summarization. Nonetheless, it is not the worst question we could be asking. Hopefully, it can be issued in a different context.

"BIG PICTURE" SUPPLEMENT

The "not the worst" question was not uttered in vain, however. We also conducted a small, concurrent survey of people who presumably view the admissions scene from a broader perspective than that of a single institution. We called it the "Big Picture Survey." The instrument was shorter and open-ended in format. The final question was the same as that on the institutional questionnaire--i.e., a solicitation of suggestions for new tests or services from ETS. This did yield a few suggestions. They are reported in the Big Picture Supplement which accompanies this report.

THE "BIG PICTURE" SUPPLEMENT

This additional phase of the study was conceived as a back-up arrangement to validate the findings of the structured survey. This was deemed appropriate since the main survey would be limited in size. (Plans called for a sample of only 90 institutions; we ended up with just 71 returned questionnaires.) So it was felt that it would be valuable to also seek the opinions of persons who view the American college admission scene today in broad perspective. Hence, the catch-term "Big Picture."

The procedure was simple. A 13-item, open-ended questionnaire was constructed, tried out on a few volunteers, revised, and then sent--along with other survey materials--to the eight ETS and one CEEB regional office staff members who assisted in the study. Their Big Picture Questionnaire instructions were to send one to some appropriate person in their region. We suggested such people as coordinators of multi-campus systems, state college system officials, executive directors of organizations like AACRAO or NACAC, regional directors of CEEB or ACT outposts or simply admissions officials who are respected as seers by their peers.

The resulting sample was less than representative. We ended up with returns from ten individuals. Five work for independent colleges. One is a semi-retired consultant whose background is in the independent sector. To further slant the sample, four of the five are from highly selective New England private colleges while the fifth represents a Western college which could be described as Neo Ivy. The geographic balance of the four remaining respondents is better. Three represent state university systems--one from the Far West, one from the Northwest and one from the Middle Atlantic States. The other is with a state university in the Rocky Mountain area. Regrettably, no spokesmen from state colleges, community colleges or professional organizations are included. The findings are predictably slanted.

There were other problems:

1. Some of the respondents failed to take the project seriously. This was evidenced by the brevity of many responses. Several omitted any number of items. It was obvious that some respondents did not read the

questions carefully or frame their answers thoughfully. Non sequiturs were not uncommon. Some gave the same answer for a series of questions when it was obviously inappropriate to do so.

2. It quickly became apparent that most of our "biggies" failed to meet our expectations. Many answers revealed surprising degrees of parochialism for people who are reputed to be abreast of their field. It was obvious that many admissions people are unaware of what is happening in other segments of higher education than their own, or even what is happening within their own segments in other areas of the nation.

3. There were disquietingly conflicting responses to some questions. Several examples: In response to questions about state university admission criteria, one respondent from an independent college said, "Requirements have stiffened" while another affirmed, "They are beginning to loosen their standards." One saw an increase in state university out-of-state recruiting; another reported a decrease. One state university predicted that more state universities will use test scores as the sole basis of admission; another sees them reducing, perhaps eliminating, admission testing.

In fairness to the respondents it should be explained that they were asked to complete the form in the late winter months, probably the most demanding time of their year. It is not surprising that some of them gave short shrift to the task. Their graciousness in doing the best they could is appreciated.

Thus, the combination of a nonrepresentative sample, some carelessness in responding, evidence of parochialism, and contradictory reports in some areas of inquiry produced findings which must be considered questionable in the sense of portraying conditions as they may actually exist. It seems likely that the results of the main survey provide a better reflection of the real world of college admissions than the information yielded by the supplementary, "big picture" effort. Nonetheless, all of the big picture respondents are people of eminence in the admissions field and their views, while often cursory and inconsistent, are valuable and deserve to be reported. While consensus may be missing, individual insights are worth heeding.

QUESTION: Between 1970 and the present time what changes have you observed in admissions criteria in the following types of institutions?

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

State Universities	The picture is unclear. Some feel requirements have gone up; others report a relaxation of standards. Some are resuming out-of-state recruiting. There is little awareness of a broad, increased emphasis on tests or a concomitant deemphasis on high school records. There is evidence of increasing interest in the preparation of entering students and ensuing placement problems. There is a trend towards more widespread adoption of the ACT-SAT, either-or, option.
State Colleges	There are indications of a gradual movement towards decreasing selectivity, increasing competition for students, less adherence to GPA and/or Rank-in-Class, and less testing. Also seen is more acceptance of either ACT or ATP results. One respondent reported an upsurge of interest at some state colleges in Advanced Placement.
Community Colleges	The door remains open.
The Independents	As one respondent suggested, a spectrum situation exists: at one end, among the prestigious institutions, little has changed; at the other end, some colleges will select "if the body is warm to the touch;" in between, many are talking the same but behaving differently (i.e., lowering criteria to accommodate the shrinking pool of candidates). Reportedly, many are beginning to accept students they would have rejected in 1970. The independents are following the trend towards the ACT/SAT option. A few private colleges have abandoned admission testing requirements.

The following ambivalent comment on the testing situation bears repeating:

The Independents (cont.)

"Changes in the high school curricula and grading standards have made it harder to evaluate the school record. This has resulted in our looking to other evidence, primarily test results, especially for students from unknown high schools. At the same time there has arisen an increased distrust of tests. The dominant factor during the past six or seven years has been a change in attitude towards testing. Most colleges are, as a result, far more flexible in interpreting test scores."

QUESTION: Between the present time and 1982 what changes do you foresee in admissions criteria in the following types of institutions:

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

State Universities

There were conflicting responses. One respondent sees an increase in applications and selectivity. One sees no change. The rest see increasing competition for students and an accompanying relaxation of standards for admission. As one said, "They desire to be more selective but it's unlikely to happen in an era of declining applications." At the same time, the problem of quality of preparation is expected to remain. This creates a paradox regarding testing: on the one hand, a tendency to disregard tests for purposes of selection; at the same time, a need for objective information for purposes of placement. This suggests that admissions is a quantitative problem while placement is a qualitative matter. One respondent sees a possibility of statewide testing being used for admissions purposes.

State Colleges

A great deal of uncertainty was evident. This is not surprising since the respondents did not include anyone from the state colleges. The sense of the

State Colleges (cont.)

group was that as costs go up and applications go down admission standards will necessarily relax in practice even though politicians may insist on the same published criteria. It is felt that some state colleges are being hurt in competition with community colleges.

Community Colleges

The door will remain open. There were no community college "experts" among the respondents. A respondent who is close to the community colleges, however, does anticipate increasing state-level control of community college, as well as state colleges, to minimize duplication of programs and prevent overexpansion of facilities.

The Independents

Projected: a slight decrease in levels of selectivity among the prestige colleges, a significant decrease for the rest. Expectations are that the gap will widen between the haves and the have-nots. Two reasons were given: the more selective colleges have strong financial aid programs; at the same time many parents are willing to sacrifice to send their sons and daughters where "fame and fortune are guaranteed."

A qualitative observation in a quantitative world: "It is true that the number of 18-year-olds will diminish. However, first, attitudes towards college-going, and second, the economy, will influence the number of applications as much as demographics."

Bringing things back into focus: "If the pool decreases so will our standards. Remember that 20 years ago our SAT means were 100 points less than they are now. A return to 1957 would hardly be disastrous."

A continuation of the ACT/SAT option is foreseen.

QUESTION: Between 1970 and the present time what changes have you observed in admission procedures in the following types of institutions?

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

State Universities

Few responses seemed to key to the key word "procedures." Nonetheless, there was uncertainty expressed regarding the extent of recruiting. Some respondents reported state universities poaching in neighboring states, necessitated by a shortage of bodies. On the other hand, other respondents report a reduction in recruiting activities among this segment, not necessarily prompted by a shortage of bodies but by a shortage of money to finance out-of-state recruiting forays. Whatever, there is general agreement of a trend towards streamlining admissions procedures in state universities, accomplished in the name of cost effectiveness. The role of the computer continues to increase, one respondent reporting an expansion of on-line services and automated admission (a la the University of Oklahoma/ACT model). Several respondents expressed concern with increasing legislative interference with admissions operations.

State Colleges

The state college report pretty closely mirrors that for the state universities: increased automation, quick action on applications, more legislative direction. One regrettable consequence of tightening budgets is less money for admission officers to attend professional meetings and keep abreast of developments in the field.

Community Colleges

Only a few people responded to the question. This possibly indicates ignorance, diffidence, or a feeling of threat on the part of other segments towards the lusty, youngest member of the higher education community. One respondent told of increasing automation in the admissions process. One community college foresees on-line admission.

The Independents	A picture unfolds of a time of intensified, student-centered recruiting. Student search services are booming. One seasoned observer sees a continued chipping away of the gentlemen's agreements of the 1960's which were intended to bring reason and order to the process--e.g., a return to no-need scholarships. In contrast, another person tells of recent cooperative efforts--e.g., the Single Application Method. (SAM).

QUESTION: Between the present time and 1982 what changes do you foresee in admission procedures in the following types of institutions?

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

State Universities	While independent colleges emphasized increasing attention to personalizing the admission procedure by means of attempting to learn more about the noncognitive characteristics of their candidates, the state university responses dwelt on changes in systems--increased use of search services, more computerization, simplified requirements. One person sees the shadow of Affirmative Action influencing procedures. There is an expectation of more flexibility in testing requirements.
State Colleges	Just about the same situation prevails as in the state universities. One respondent thinks state colleges may take the lead in programs for non-traditional students
Community Colleges	Not enough responses to report.
The Independents	Generally, a moderate increase in current activities are indicated. Specifically mentioned were: intensified recruiting, more "unethical" activities, more no need scholarships, less adherence to common reply dates. At the same time, some collaboration in activities of mutual benefit (e.g., common applications). One respondent predicts

The Independents (cont.)	that admissions offices will exercise more global judgments on applicants rather than relying on one or two standard factors ("unless the courts dictate otherwise.") A state university respondent expects to see the independents taking the lead in new marketing techniques.

QUESTION: Between 1970 and the present time have any statewide testing programs had any effect on collegiate admission and/or placement practices in your state/region? If so, in what ways?

No	7
Yes	2
No Response	1

COMMENTS

California	"Results of a mandated eleventh grade testing program have heightened concern with a decline in basic skills to the point where the University of California may require certification of competence before enrollment."
Oregon	"The Washington Pre-College Test has made limited inroads at public and independent colleges near the border. Most have agreed to accept WPC scores in lieu of SAT or ACT."

QUESTION: Do you anticipate that state testing programs will have any effect in your state/region between now and 1980? If so, in what ways?

No	8
Yes	1
Maybe	1

COMMENTS

New England	"One result of aggressive recruiting could be the substitution of a variety of examinations--including state tests--for the traditional tests."

Far West	"There will be continuing concern with competencies of admitted students in the basic skills until improvement is shown."
Middle Atlantic	"One chancellor for higher education is pressing for statewide competency testing. He disclaims that the source will be used for admission but some public colleges are concerned that once the program is in place pressure will arise to use the results for admission/exclusion."

QUESTION: Have any of the changes suggested by the previous questions had any impact on the uses of existing tests within the past five years or so?

Yes	4
No	4
No Response	2

COMMENTS

The shift towards the ACT/SAT, either/or option was mentioned.

Ambivalence towards standardized tests was evident. Some comments indicated a desire on the part of many colleges to rely less on tests, yet questions regarding high school grading standards have increased their dependence on objective assessment.

The practice of some four-year, public institutions (e.g., the U. of Oklahoma) to admit solely on the basis of information reported by the testing service was noted.

QUESTION: Do you feel that any of the changes suggested by the previous questions are apt to have any impact on testing within the next five years or so?

Yes	5
No	1
No Response	4

COMMENTS

"Many institutions will tend to use what test data they can get and be less demanding in requiring specific test scores."

"A general tightening-up of freshmen requirements suggests increased need for placement tests in English and mathematics. The anticipated decrease in admission testing leads to the same conclusion."

"Increased pressure on the colleges by high school counselors on behalf of students to justify test requirements through demonstrated use is expected in some areas."

The possibility was mentioned of state testing program results substituting for national testing program scores for admission purposes.

One respondent foresees expansion of the admit-by-test-report model (a la U. of Oklahoma).

QUESTION: What are the implications, if any, of these changes for new developments in testing and other forms of assessment?

RESPONSES

"As colleges admit growing numbers of less able students we will need a greater variety of ways to assess ability and potential in a wide range of academic skills."

From the Private Sector

"I sincerely hope ETS will construct essay tests. Multiple-choice tests do not adequately test subject knowledge and the ability to express one's self."

"If new and better tests are devised, they will be used but the role of tests in admission has peaked, in my opinion. Greater reliance on grades, subjective judgments and, perhaps, the ability to pay may be down the road."

"In a period of declining applications what difference will it (new types of tests) make?"

"Tests will be used primarily to streamline the admissions process and, thereby, to save money."

"Perhaps some new instruments in which representatives of minority communities have more direct input would alleviate chronic complaints about test bias."

"The score decline may be creating a climate in which new tests with new scales and new norms will be the way to go."

"Some see a need for inexpensive, easy-to-administer-and-score placement tests to accommodate the expected diversity in backgrounds of students."

"It will be necessary to foster acceptance by faculties before CLEP test use will expand. This will require that the tests have a high degree of content validity and clear-cut evidence of their ability to discriminate among students who are well-prepared and those who are poorly prepared. In other words, CLEP needs better tests, better norming and better evidence of validity."

"The movement towards competency-based graduation requirements in some states lends support for the development of populist achievement tests. In the absence of state testing program data in student records, colleges will be at a loss to objectively assess levels of student preparation."

SUMMARY

1. Among our sampled institutions we found little evidence of devaluation of high school grades or of a resurgence of testing in college admissions at this time. The role of testing appears to have remained virtually unchanged since 1970. However, a modest increase in emphasis on testing is anticipated.

2. An increase in the use of all nonintellective factors (interviews, activity records, etc.) is expected, with one notable exception: the recommendation. A moderate decrease in reliance on recommendations from high school officials is foreseen. Comments suggest that this phenomenon is mostly attributable to the Buckley Amendment.

3. Over half of the responding colleges reported no changes in admission standards since 1970; one-fourth reported raising them; 16 percent said they had lowered standards somewhat.

4. The forecasting of the colleges who participated in the survey is at variance with national projections of declining enrollments. Most colleges in our sample apparently assume it will affect others. Only ten percent expect to lower standards while 47 percent foresee raising them. A particularly startling return came from the independent sector, where seven of 16 colleges classified as moderately-to-minimally selective" say they expect to raise their standards.

5. Little evidence emerged to support high school counselors' perennial complaints of a gap between requirement and utilization of admission tests. Only four public institutions reported using the results of required tests infrequently in either admissions or placement decisions.

6. There is evidence that the purposes and limitations of the TSWE are misunderstood. One-fourth of the respondents reported using it in decisions to admit or reject students. (See also Finding 17-b-6.)

7. A moderate trend in increased requirements of ATP and ACT tests for admissions purposes since 1970 was shown among the sample. A levelling-off is predicted. However, a significant minority of the colleges reported not using any CEEB or ACT tests in admissions decisions.

8. More confusion than information resulted from a question regarding special consideration for special applicants (e.g., minority students, the handicapped, foreign students, athletes, women for male-dominated programs, etc.). There were no clear patterns. We can only say that some places say they are doing some things for some students.

9. Definite increases in general recruiting activities among all segments of higher education are occurring and will continue to occur.

10. There is no evidence of widespread efforts to recruit special categories of students. Half of the colleges actively recruit minority students. Older students, veterans, women for male-laden majors and foreign students are all sought to lesser degrees.

11. Recruiting practices vary by type of institution. For example, almost all of the highly selective independent colleges actively recruit minority students; yet only one-third of the less-selective independents do so.

12. Despite national projections of declining pools of traditional applicants, few of the sampled colleges have plans to attract Pat Cross's "new students." Apparently colleges plan to increase recruiting in an undifferentiated manner, with little or no intent to target their efforts. A need for a marketing approach is indicated.

13. In contrast, declining enrollments are having, and will continue to have, demonstrable effects on the curricula in many colleges. Colleges seem more willing to alter their offerings than their clientele.

14. Few changes are occurring in procedures to select students in most colleges. It appears that the same people are admitting, or not admitting, the same types of students in the same ways.

15. The practice of rolling admissions increased in popularity during the 1970's: 76 percent of the responding colleges reporting that they now admit/reject as applications are received rather than during a specified period. It appears, however, that the trend has peaked. Rolling admissions seems to have been adopted in most of the colleges for which it is suited.

16. A definite elevation of placement standards in freshman English and mathematics since 1970 was reported.

17. There are many ways in which colleges place freshmen in English and mathematics. Given great diversity, a few generalizations can be made:

a. In general:

1. Considerable variation exists in the attitude of colleges about the usefulness of high school grades. Some colleges accord them complete respect, others distrust them. It is clear that most math and English placement decisions are determined by the respective departments. Departmental control over placement is definitely on the increase.

b. In English:

1. In general, high school grades are accorded a fair measure of respect by most colleges.

2. The ratio of use vs. non-use of high school English grades runs about two to one.

3. A majority of the responding colleges reported no change since 1970 in the importance of test or high school grades in English placement considerations.

4. There is no evidence of a widespread loss of confidence by college English departments in high school English grades.

5. Attitudes of colleges towards tests for use in English placement varies widely, running from great dependence to utter disdain.

6. There is some misunderstanding of the appropriate function of the SAT and, particularly, the TSWE in regards to placement. Many colleges which receive TSWE scores are not yet using them.

c. In Mathematics:

1. The picture is generally the same as in English, although there is somewhat more confidence in high school grades.

2. There is evidence of occasional inappropriate use of SAT-M for placement in lieu of the ACH Math Level I or II tests.

3. Locally developed placement testing, especially in mathematics, appears to be entrenched in many colleges.

18. There are definite indications of a movement towards greater use of essays for placement in freshman composition. The requirement of writing samples went up from 29 percent to 55 percent among the respondent colleges between 1970 and 1977. Indications are that the trend has levelled out, however.

19. At the same time, the role of objective tests of writing ability has not diminished. This is at least partly because the combined use of both direct and indirect measures of writing skills appears to be on the rise after a dip in popularity in recent years.

20. The recent upsurge of interest in direct measure of writing ability suggests some measurement needs which ETS is uniquely prepared to serve.

21. The impact of statewide testing programs on the broad American college admissions testing picture appears to be negligible.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

1. Other surveys of trends and patterns in collegiate admission and placement could be conducted at considerably less effort and cost with some cumulative benefit. It would seem to be a logical on-going field activity. The basic survey instrument should probably be streamlined and tabulation and analysis should be speeded up through utilization of the computer. The primary need, in our opinion is for the application of more sophisticated sampling techniques.

2. It would be interesting to more accurately measure the change in the use of tests in college admission and placement as a consequence of the so-called grade devaluation. (Reference: page ii, table 1; page vi, table 7.)

3. The survey offered evidence of an apparently anomolous variance between many colleges' expectations of increasing admissions standards in the face of national projections of declining numbers of applicants. An inquiry into this curious phenomenon could be instructive and might jar some institutions into facing up to the inexorable facts. (Reference: page iii, table 3.)

4. Further investigation into the alleged lack of use of required tests by some public, four-year colleges, would help settle a nagging grievance of high school counselors. (Reference: page iv, table 5; page xx, table 28.)

5. This study corroborated other reports of a widespread misunderstanding of the purposes of the Test of Standard Written English. This warrants additional investigation. There is considerable evidence that the potentially useful TSWE is, at present, little more than a bump on the ATP log. Immediate corrective action is called for. (Reference: page v, table 6; page xiv, table 20.)

6. The general impression that most colleges are raising placement standards in English and mathematics was supported by the survey. The magnitude of the trend as well as the degree of elevation of expectations remain to be assessed. (Reference: page xiv, table 19.)

7. The question of a loss of confidence by colleges in high school grades was not answered by the study. The findings were conclusively inconclusive. This is something which is widely discussed yet there are little or no data to support the various assertions. A definitive study is in order. (Reference: page xiv, table 20; page xv, table 21; page xvi, table 22.)

8. There appears to be great differentiation in the use of tests for placement purposes at the freshman level. It might represent a major contribution if someone were to identify various models, carefully monitor some examples, and evaluate the effectiveness of each. (Reference: page xiv, table 20; page xvi, table 22.)

9. There is some indication of inappropriate use of the SAT-Math test for placement purposes. This might be checked out. (Reference: page xvi, table 22.)

10. We need further information about the extent and effectiveness of direct versus indirect measures of writing ability. A comprehensive, in-depth study could result in a delineation of needs and a determination of the most appropriate products and/or services ETS and CEEB can provide. (Reference: page xix, tables 26-27.)

11. Several of the "big picture" respondents foresaw a movement towards colleges admitting/rejecting applicants on the basis of information submitted by students via ACT or ATP reports which also serve as applications and interim high school transcripts. A few "biggies" also expressed concern about the incursion of statewide testing programs into the college admissions testing realm. Periodic regional readings of these developments should be made. (References: Big Picture Supplement.)

APPENDIX A

RESPONDING INSTITUTIONS

NAME OF INSTITUTION	STATE	RESPONDENT/TITLE
Community Colleges		
Blue Mountain Community College	Oregon	Truman A. Baily Registrar
Bronx Community College	New York	Harvey Erdsneker Registrar & Admission Officer
Casper College	Wyoming	Richard Means Director of Testing
College of the Canyons	California	B. L. Shearer Dean Admissions & Records
College of San Mateo	California	Philip Morse Director Special Programs & Services
Community College of Denver Red Rocks Campus	Colorado	Russell Riley Director, Counseling Center
Community College of Vermont	Vermont	Jackalyn West Registrar
Dekalb Community College	Georgia	Mr. Velon H. Gray Admission Coord., Central Campus
Greater Hartford Community College	Connecticut	C. Raymond Hughes Director of Admissions
Houston Community College	Texas	Emmett Pugh Director of Admissions & Records
Manatee Junior College	Florida	Mr. Gilbert W. McNeal Dean of Admissions and Records
Merritt College	California	George Herring Assistant Dean
Monroe Community College	New York	Anthony J. Felicetti Director of Admissions
Seattle Central Community College	Washington	Leroy Fails Dean of Students

NAME OF INSTITUTION	STATE	RESPONDENT/TITLE
Independent Colleges		
Bowdoin College	Maine	William R. Mason Director of Admissions
Brigham Young University	Utah	Robert W. Spencer Dean of Admissions and Records
Cedar Crest College	Pennsylvania	Fred Cort Director of Admissions and Coordinator of College Relations
Chapman College	California	Michael Fox Director of Admissions
Holy Names College	California	Shelley Pighin Director of Admissions
Lehigh University	Pennsylvania	Samuel H. Missimer Director of Admission
Lubbock Christian College	Texas	Dale Gannaward Admissions Counselor
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Massachusetts	Peter H. Richardson Director of Admissions
Mills College	California	Betti Spagel Acting Dean of Admissions
Newberry College	South Carolina	Ray Sharpe Dean of Admissions
Northwestern University	Illinois	Roger H. Campbell Director Undergraduate Admission
Pomona College	California	John Quinlan Dean of Admissions
Regis College	Colorado	William R. Regan Director of Admissions
Rice University	Texas	Richard Stabell Director of Admissions
Roger Williams College	Rhode Island	Robert P. Nemec Director of Admissions

NAME OF INSTITUTION	STATE	RESPONDENT/TITLE
Independent Colleges (contd)		
Stanford University	California	Fred Hargadon Dean of Admissions
Stetson University	Florida	Mr. Gary A. Meadows Director of Admission
Taylor University	Indiana	Ronald L. Keller Director of Admissions and Title III Coordinator
Trinity University	Texas	Walter P. West Director of Academic Services
University of Portland	Oregon	Dan Reilly Director of Admission
Whitman College	Washington	William D. Tingley Director of Admissions
Whittier College	California	Michael Adams Director of Admissions
Wilmington College	Deleware	Rick Bechtold Director of Admissions Advertising Public Relations
State Colleges		
California State College, Dominguez Hills	California	Sue Gemmell Dean of Admissions and Records
California State College, Stanislaus	California	Edward J. Aubert Director of Admissions & Relations With Schools
California State University, Hayward	California	Daniel C. Salcido Associate Director Admissions and Records
California State University, Long Beach	California	Leonard Kreutner Director of Admissions and Records
Central Connecticut State College	Connecticut	Johnie M. Floyd Director of Admissions

NAME OF INSTITUTION	STATE	RESPONDENT/TITLE
State Colleges (contd)		
Georgia Southern College	Georgia	Mr. Lloyd L. Joyner Registrar/Director of Admissions
Henderson State University	Arkansas	Hershel Lucht Registrar
Mesa College	Colorado	Jack Scott Director of Admissions
Metropolitan State University	Minnesota	Jane Pyle Acting Director of Admissions
Weber State College	Utah	Milton C. Mecham Dean Admissions and Records
Missouri Western State College	Missouri	Tom Robinson Director of Admissions & Registrar
Northeastern Oklahoma State Univer University	Oklahoma	James A. Watkins Director of Admissions & Registrar
Oregon College of Education	Oregon	Stanley Kenyon Registrar & Director of Admissions
Southern Arkansas University	Arkansas	D. A. Haefner Vice President for Student Affairs
University of Lowell	Massachusetts	Mary E. McGawran Vice President Student Affairs
Virginia State College	Virginia	Edward L. Smith Director of Admissions
Towson State University	Maryland	Michael L. Mahoney Director of Admissions
State Universities		
Colorado State University	Colorado	Len Overturf Director of Admissions & Records
George Mason University	Virginia	Clenton A. Blount, Jr. Director of Admissions

NAME OF INSTITUTION	STATE	RESPONDENT/TITLE
State Universities (contd)		
Kansas State University	Kansas	Richard N. Elkins Director of Admission
Northern Arizona University	Arizona	Dr. M. D. Schroeder Dean of Admissions & Records
Portland State University	Oregon	Eileen M. Rose Director of Admission
University of California, Irvine	California	Dr. James Dunning Director of Admission
University of California, Los Angeles	California	Dorothy Workman Director of Admissions
University of California, San Diego	California	Ronald J. Bowker Registrar & Admissions Officer
University of Georgia	Georgia	M. O. Phelps Director of Admissions
University of Maine Portland-Gorham	Maine	William J. Munsey Director of Admissions
University of New Hampshire	New Hampshire	Eugene A. Savage Director of Admissions
University of Northern Colorado	Colorado	Gary E. Miller Director of Admissions
University of Oregon	Oregon	James R. Buch Director of Admissions
University of Texas at Austin	Texas	R. Rex Jackson Associate Director of Admissions
University of Texas at San Antonio	Texas	Richard L. Lewis Director of Admissions & Registrar
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater	Wisconsin	I. A. Madsen Director of Admissions

APPENDIX B

71

SURVEY OF CHANGING

ADMISSION PRACTICES AND STANDARDS

General Instructions:

1. Please don't mark between boxes. We're aware that some items resist easy categorization of response but marks between boxes are difficult to aggregate with other responses.

2. Many of the questions ask for projections to 1982. Obviously, no one can accurately look into the future. Collective, professional forecasting is often quite predictive; so please just make your best guess.

3. There is ample space for comments. Feel free to use it.

Respondent: _____

Title: _____

Name of Institution: _____

Location: _____

74

75

Location of Institution:

- ☐ Large city (500,000 or larger)
- ☐ Medium-size city (100,000-500,000)
- ☐ Suburb in a metropolitan area
- ☐ Small city (25,000-100,000)
- ☐ Town (25,000 or under)
- ☐ Rural area near a large or medium-size city
- ☐ Rural area not near a large or medium-size city

Approximate undergraduate enrollment:

Full-time students_____

Total undergraduate enrollment_____

Comments:

Type of Institution:

- ☐ Public - two-year
- ☐ Public - four-year
- ☐ Independent - non-church affiliated
- ☐ Independent - church affiliated

Which?_____

Selectivity:

- ☐ Freshmen mostly from top 10% of high school class
- ☐ Mostly from top 25%
- ☐ Mostly from top 50%
- ☐ Most, but not all freshman applicants admitted
- ☐ Essentially open admission

CHANGES IN ADMISSION STANDARDS

Respondents at public institutions please note: In this section, answer with reference to entering freshmen who are residents of your state.

1. Which of the following do you require of candidates for admission?

2. Have the factors to the left become more or less important in admissions decisions since 1970? (Mark one)

3. Do you anticipate that these factors will become more or less important between now and 1982?

	1.	2. Much more important	2. More important	2. No Change	2. Less important	2. Much less important	3. Much more important	3. More important	3. No Change	3. Less important	3. Much less important
a. High school record	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Test results	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Recommendations	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Interview	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Extracurricular activities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Community service	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Work experiences	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. Other (specify)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

_____

Comments: 78

	Substantially Raised	Moderately Raised	No Change	Moderately Lowered	Substantially Lowered
4. In general, how have admission standards changed at your institution since 1970?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. How do you anticipate admission standards will change at your institution between now and 1982?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

USE OF TESTS IN ADMISSIONS DECISIONS

Respondents at public institutions please note: In this section, answer with reference to entering freshmen who are residents of your state.

6. If you use any of the tests below in admission decisions, for each one check the box which best describes how each is used. (Check "N/A" if you don't use a particular test in admissions.)

	N/A	Specifically Required	One of Several Required Options	Recommended but not Required; Used if Submitted	Neither Recommended nor Required; Used if Submitted
a. ACT	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. SAT	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. TSWE	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. ACH's	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Other (specify)					
_____		☐	☐	☐	☐
_____		☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

7. If you require tests of all (or almost all) applicants for admission to your institution, for what proportion of the applicants are test results utilized in admission decisions?

- ☐ N/A
- ☐ All or almost all of the applicants
- ☐ More than three-fourths
- ☐ About three-fourths
- ☐ About half
- ☐ About one-fourth
- ☐ Less than one-fourth
- ☐ None or almost none

8. If you require tests of all (or almost all) applicants for admission to your institution, for what proportion of the applicants are specific test results utilized in admission decisions?

	N/A	All or Almost All	More than 3/4	About 3/4	About 1/2	About 1/4	Less than 1/4	None or Almost None
a. ACT	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. SAT	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. TSWE	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. ACH's	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Other (specify)								
..		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
_____		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Has the use of tests in admission decisions changed at your institution since 1970?

	Increased Use	Little or no Change	Decreased Use
a. ACT	☐	☐	☐
b. SAT	☐	☐	☐
c. TSWE	☐	☐	☐
d. ACH's	☐	☐	☐
e. Other (specify)			
_____	☐	☐	☐
_____	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

10. Do you anticipate the use of tests in admission decisions will change between now and 1982?

Increasing Use	Little or no Change	Decreasing Use
☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐

78

ADMISSION DECISIONS REQUIRING SPECIAL CONSIDERATION

11. Currently, which of the following types of students are accorded special consideration in admissions decisions at your institution?

12. Has the number given special consideration changed since 1970? (Mark one for each type.)

13. Do you anticipate that the number given special consideration will change by 1982?

	11.	12. Substantially Increased	12. Moderately Increased	12. No Change	12. Moderately Decreased	12. Substantially Decreased	13. Substantial Increase	13. Moderate Increase	13. No Change	13. Moderate Decrease	13. Substantial Decrease
a. Athletes	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Foreign students	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Handicapped	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Minorities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Non-residents of your state	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Older persons (over 25)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Those without high school diplomas	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
i. Veterans	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
j. Others (specify)											☐
_____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
_____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

88

Comments:

87

CHANGES IN RECRUITING ACTIVITIES

14. Have your recruiting activities changed since 1970?

15. Do you anticipate your recruiting activities will change between now and 1982?

	14. N/A	14. Much Greater Use	14. Somewhat Greater Use	14. No Change	14. Less Use	14. Much Less Use	15. N/A	15. Much Greater Use	15. Somewhat Greater Use	15. No Change	15. Much Less Use	15. Less Use
a. School visitations	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Participation in College Fairs, College Nights, etc.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Use of faculty	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Use of students	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Use of alumni	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Advertising via media	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Use of commercial marketing firms	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. Major revision of publications	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Use of search services -Which?	☐						☐					
i. ACT ☐		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
j. CEEB ☐		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
k. National Merit ☐		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
l. NSS FNS ☐		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
m. Other (specify) ☐		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

80

16. Which of the following types of students does your institution currently make a special effort to recruit?

17. Have these efforts increased or decreased since 1970?

18. Do you anticipate that these efforts will change between now and 1982?

	16.	17. Substantially Increased	17. Moderately Increased	17. No Change	17. Moderately Decreased	17. Substantially Decreased	18. Substantial Increase	18. Moderate Increase	18. No Change	18. Moderate Decrease	18. Substantial Decrease
a. Foreign students	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Minorities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Occupational groups (law enforcement, nurses, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Older students (over 25)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Prisoners	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Vets	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Women in certain fields (e.g., engineering, math)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. Other (specify)											
_____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
_____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

CHANGES IN CURRICULUM

	Great Extent	Some Extent	Small Extent	Not at All
19. To what extent has the enrollmen situation prompted curricular changes in your institution since 1970?	☐	☐	☐	☐
20. To what extent do you expect the enrollment situation to prompt curricular changes at your institution between now and 1982?	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

	A Large Number	A Moderate Number	A Few	None
21. Since 1970, how many new programs and/or majors have been added at your institution in part to stimulate enrollment?	☐	☐	☐	☐

Which have been particularly helpful?

					Can't Say
22. How many new programs and/or majors do you anticipate adding at your institution to stimulate enrollment between now and 1982?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

What are you planning?

CHANGES IN SELECTION PROCEDURES

23. Which of the following characterize your current selection procedures?

24. How have selection procedures at your institution changed since 1970?

25. How do you anticipate your selection procedures will change between now and 1982?

		24. Much More Important	24. More Important	24. No Change	24. Less Important	24. Much Less Important	25. Much More Important	25. More Important	25. No Change	25. Less Important	25. Much Less Important
a. Faculty involvement	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Student involvement	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Use of lottery system	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Other (specify)											
_____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
_____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Open admission policy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

CHANGES IN APPLICATION AND NOTIFICATION PROCEDURES

26. Which of the following currently characterize application and notification procedures at your institution?	27. In 1970?	28. By 1982?
a. Rolling admissions	☐	☐
b. Subscription to a common candidate reply date	☐	☐
c. Early decision offered	☐	☐
d. Other (specify) _____	☐	☐

	Yes	No
29. Have you extended the opening of the application period since 1970?	☐	☐
30. Do you expect to extend it between now and 1982?	☐	☐
31. Have you extended the application deadline since 1970?	☐	☐
32. Do you expect to extend it between now and 1982?	☐	☐

Comments:

CHANGES IN PLACEMENT STANDARDS

33. Have placement standards for basic, college-level courses at your institution changed since 1970?

	N/A	Substantially Raised	Moderately Raised	No Change	Moderately Lowered	Substantially Lowered
a. In English	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. In Mathematics	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

34. Do you anticipate that placement standards will change between now and 1982?

	N/A	Substantially Raised	Moderately Raised	No Change	Moderately Lowered	Substantially Lowered
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

USE OF TESTS IN PLACEMENT DECISIONS

Currently how important are the following factors in placement of students in Freshman English classes at your institution?

36. Since 1970, have they become more or less important?

37. Between now and 1982, do you anticipate they will become more or less important?

	Very Important	Of Some Importance	Not Used/ Unimportant	Much More Important	More Important	No Change	Less Important	Much Less Important	Much More Important	More Important	No Change	Less Important	Much Less Important
a. High school GPA	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. High school English grades	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Standardized tests													
c. ACT	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. SAT	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. TSWE	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. ACH/ECT	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Others (specify)													
_____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
_____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. Local test(s)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

86

38. Currently how important are the following factors in placement of students in Freshman Math classes at your institution?

39. Since 1970, have they become more or less important?

40. Between now and 1982, do you anticipate they will become more or less importan

	Very Important	Of Some Importance	Not Used/ Unimportant	Much More Important	More Important	No Change	Less Important	Much Less Important	Much More Important	More Important	No Change	Less Important	Much Less Importa
a. High school GPA	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. High school Math grades	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Standardized tests													
c. ACT	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. SAT	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. ACH/Math	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Others (specify)													
_____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
_____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Local test(s)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

41 Currently, by whom are Math placement decisions at your institution usually made?

		In 1970?	By 1982?
a.	Students	☐	☐	☐
b.	Counselors	☐	☐	☐
c.	Advisors	☐	☐	☐
d.	Math Dept.	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

42. If there is a Freshman English requirement at your institution, who usually decides where students are to be placed? (Check "N/A" if there is no Freshmen English requirement.)

		In 1970?	By 1982?
a.	N/A	☐	☐	☐
b.	Students	☐	☐	☐
c.	Counselors	☐	☐	☐
d.	Advisors	☐	☐	☐
e.	English Dept.	☐	☐	☐

43. For the purposes of making English placement decisions, do you currently require a test of writing ability of students entering your institution? (Check if "yes".)

☐ ☐ ☐

44. If you do require measures of writing ability of entering students, what type are they?

a.	Writing test	☐	☐	☐
b.	Objective test	☐	☐	☐
c.	Combination	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

45. If you require tests for all, or almost all, applicants for admission to your institution, in approximately what proportion of the cases do test results have a bearing on student placement decisions?

- ☐ N/A
- ☐ All or almost all
- ☐ More than three-fourths
- ☐ About three-fourths
- ☐ About half
- ☐ About one-fourth
- ☐ Less than one-fourth
- ☐ None or almost none

Comments:

USE OF STATEWIDE TESTING PROGRAMS IN COLLEGE ADMISSION AND PLACEMENT

In general, there are two types of statewide testing programs which provide scores which are, or could be, utilized by colleges for admission and for placement purposes. One type is a specially-designed pre-college testing program (e.g., the Washington Pre-College Test). The other type is a state-mandated testing program (e.g., for all eleventh graders).

46. Use by your institution of statewide testing program results. (Check "N/A" if seldom or never received or used.)

	Currently?			In 1970?			By 1982?		
	N/A	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No
a. In admission decisions	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. In placement decisions	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

90

ONE IMPORTANT FINAL QUESTION

Do you have any suggestions for new or improved tests, other assessment measures, or other services which ETS might provide which would be helpful to institutions like yours in the 1980's?

APPENDIX C

EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE
Western Office

Survey of Changes in Undergraduate Admissions Criteria and Procedures

"BIG PICTURE" QUESTIONNAIRE

Note to Respondents:

A limited number of these questionnaires are being administered to individuals in various regions of the country who view the college admissions scene from a broader perspective. You have been asked to complete the following questions because you are in such a position. You will be required to do some generalizing and to make a few predictions.

The initial purpose of the survey is to provide a report for ETS and CEEB. It may eventually be expanded and published. In any event, the findings will be shared with you. Your responses will be treated confidentially.

_____
Organization You Represent

_____
Location

_____ _____
Your Name Title

Between 1970 and the present time what changes have you observed in admissions criteria in:

a. state universities?

b. state colleges?

c. community colleges?

d. independent colleges?

Between the present time and 1982 what changes to you foresee in admissions criteria in:

a. state universities?

b. state colleges?

c. community colleges

d. independent colleges

3. Between 1970 and the present time what changes have you observed in admissions procedures in:

   a. state universities?

   b. state colleges?

   c. community colleges?

   d. independent colleges?

4. Between the present time and 1982 what changes do you foresee in admissions procedures in:

   a. state universities?

   b. state colleges?

   c. community colleges?

   d. independent colleges?

5. Between 1970 the the present time have any statewide testing programs (such as the Washington Pre-College Test or the mandated state testing program for 11th graders in California) had any effect on admission and/or placement practices at any colleges or universities in your state/region?

6. If so, in what ways?

7. Do you anticipate that any such state testing programs will have any such effects in your state/region between now and 1980?

8. If so, in what ways?

9. Have any of the above changes (suggested in questions 1-8) had any impact on the uses of existing tests within the past five years or so?

10. If so, in what ways?

11. Do you feel that any of these changes (suggested in questions 1-8) are apt to have any impact on the use of existing tests within the next five years or so?

12. If so, in what ways?

13. What are the implications, if any, of these changes for new developments in testing and other forms of assessment?

TABLES A - G

COMPARATIVE PROFILES:

SURVEY SAMPLES VS. NATIONAL SUMMARY DATA*

*National profile data from ACE Fact Book on Higher Educaion, 1976.

Table A. Number and percent distribution of responding institutions by control of institutions--compared to national profile of Fall 1975

	Total	Public		Private	
	N	%	(N)	%	(N)
Responding institutions	70	67	(47)	33	(23)
National profile	3,055	48	(1,454)	52	(1,601)

Table B. Number and percent distribution of responding institutions by highest level of offering and control of institution--compared to national profile of Fall 1975.

	Institutions offering as highest level:											
	2 but less than 4 years beyond the 12th grade				Bachelor's and/or 1st professional degree				Master's and beyond, but less than doctorate				Doctor of Philosophy and equivalent			
	Public		Private		Public		Private		Public		Private		Public		Private	
	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)
Responding institutions	100	(14)	0	(0)	31	(4)	69	(9)	73	(16)	27	(6)	62	(13)	38	(8)
National profile	79	(901)	21	(240)	12	(106)	88	(766)	39	(250)	61	(387)	49	(197)	51	(208)

Table C. Number and percent distribution of responding institutions by highest level of offering--compared to national profile of Fall 1975

		Institutions Offering as Highest Level:							
	Total	2 but less than 4 years beyond the 12th grade		Bachelor's and/or 1st professional degree		Master's and beyond but less than doc.		Doctor of Phil. and equiv.	
		%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)
Responding Institutions	70	20	(14)	19	(13)	31	(22)	30	(21)
National Profile	3,055	37	(1,141)	29	(872)	21	(637)	13	(405)

Table D. Number and percent distribution of responding institutions by region--compared to national profile of Fall 1975

	Responding Institutions		National Profile	
	%	(N)	%	(N)
New England	13	(9)	8	(250)
Mideast	10	(7)	20	(604)
Southeast	14	(10)	22	(675)
Great Lakes	3	(2)	16	(491)
Plains	4	(3)	11	(324)
Southwest	11	(8)	7	(228)
Rocky Mountain	11	(8)	3	(82)
Far West	33	(23)	12	(364)
U.S. Service Schools and Outlying Parts	0	(0)	1	(37)
All regions	100	(70)	100	(3,055)

Table E. Number and percent distribution of responding institutions by highest level of offering and region

	Total	Institutions Offering as Highest Level:							
		2 but less than 4 years		Bachelor's and/or 1st professional degree		Master's and beyond, but less than doc.		Doctor of Philosophy and equivalent	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)
New England	9	22	(2)	11	(1)	22	(2)	44	(4)
Mideast	7	29	(2)	43	(3)	14	(1)	14	(1)
Southeast	10	20	(2)	10	(1)	50	(5)	20	(2)
Great Lakes	2					50	(1)	50	(1)
Plains	3			66	(2)			33	(1)
Southwest	8	13	(1)	13	(1)	38	(3)	38	(3)
Rocky Mountain	8	25	(2)	33	(3)			38	(3)
Far West	23	22	(5)	9	(2)	44	(10)	26	(6)
U.S. Service Schools and Outlying Parts	0		(0)		(0)		(0)		(0)
All Regions	70	20	(14)	19	(13)	31	(22)	30	(21)

Table F. Number and percent distribution of United States institutions of higher education by highest level of offering and region, Fall 1975

	Total	Institutions Offering as Highest Level:							
		2 but less than 4 years		Bachelor's and/or 1st professional degree		Master's and beyond, but less than doctorate		Doctor or Philosophy, and equivalent	
	N	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)
New England	250	33	(82)	29	(73)	26	(65)	12	(30)
Mideast	604	29	(177)	28	(168)	27	(161)	16	(98)
Southeast	675	40	(273)	32	(218)	17	(113)	11	(71)
Great Lakes	491	36	(178)	30	(148)	21	(105)	12	(60)
Plains	324	35	(114)	40	(130)	14	(46)	10	(34)
Southwest	228	45	(102)	22	(50)	16	(36)	18	(40)
Rocky Mountain	82	41	(34)	22	(18)	18	(15)	18	(15)
Far West	364	46	(167)	15	(56)	25	(90)	14	(51)
U.S. Service Schools and Outlying Parts	37	35	(13)	16	(6)	16	(6)	11	(4)
All Regions	3,055	37	(1141)	29	(872)	21	(637)	13	(405)

Table G. Percent distributions of responding institutions by size of enrollment and region--compared to national profile of 1976

	Percent of Responding Institutions With Enrollment of:				Percent of U.S. Institutions of Higher Learning with Enrollment of:			
	<1000	1,000-4,999	5,000-9,999	≥10,000	<1000	1,000-4,999	5,000-9,999	≥10,000
New England		56%	22%	22%	50	39%	7%	4%
Mideast	29%	29	29	14	40	39	12	9
Southeast	10	60	20	10	41	43	9	7
Great Lakes			100		44	34	11	11
Plains		66		33	55	32	7	5
Southwest		50	25	25	30	45	13	11
Rocky Mountain		50	25	25	41	36	14	9
Far West	9	39	26	26	37	30	18	14
All Regions	7	46	26	21	42	38	11	8

TABLES 1 - 29

TO ACCOMPANY A SURVEY OF
TRENDS AND PATTERNS IN COLLEGIATE
ADMISSION AND PLACEMENT

TM006 803

Table 1. Percent of institutions at which certain factors are required for admission*

High school record	90%
Test results	75
Recommendations	31
Extracurricular activities	10
Interview	7
Work experiences	4
Community service	1
Other	6

*Table entries are in percentages of total number of institutions (N=70).

Table 2. Percentage of institutions indicating a change in importance of various factors in admission decisions*

Factor in admission decisions	Since 1970				Between now and 1982			
	More important	No change	Less important	(N)	More important	No change	Less important	(N)
High school record	38%	57%	5%	(61)	36%	62%	2%	(58)
Test results	31	45	24	(55)	33	61	5	(55)
Recommendations	18	54	29	(28)	12	65	23	(26)
Extracurricular activities	5	63	32	(19)	27	55	18	(22)
Interview	25	55	20	(20)	32	47	21	(19)
Work experiences	24	59	18	(17)	29	71		(17)
Community service	20	47	33	(15)	25	56	19	(16)
Other	60	40		(5)	20	80		(5)

*Table entries are in percentages of those responding to each item (variable N's).

Table 3. Percentage of institutions indicating an overall change in admission standards*

	Raised	No change	Lowered	No response
Since 1970	26%	57%	16%	1%
Between now and 1982	40	47	10	3

*Table entries are in percentages of total number of institutions (N=70).

Table 4. Percentage of institutions at which use is made of selected tests in admission decisions*

	ACT	SAT	TSWE	ACH's	Other
Specifically required	16%	33%	4%	13%	6%
One of several required options	31	30	1		4
Recommended, but not required; used if submitted	7	7	6	11	1
Neither recommended nor required; used if submitted	13	10	13	11	1
Not used in admission decisions	24	17	39	29	
No response	9	3	37	36	88

*Table entries are in percentages of total number of institutions (N=70).

Table 5. Percentage of applicants for whom required test results are utilized in admission decisions--for institutions which require tests of all (or almost all) applicants for admission*

All or almost all	60%
More than three-fourths	4
About three-fourths	
About half	6
About one-fourth	2
Less than one-fourth	13
None or almost none	15

*Table entries are in percentages of those responding to the question (N=53).

Table 6. Percentage of applicants for whom results of specific required tests are utilized in admission decisions—for institutions which require tests of all (or almost all) applicants for admission*

	ACT	SAT	TSWE	ACH's	Other
All or almost all	16%	38%	17%	17%	20%
More than three-fourths	3	15	8		
About three-fourths	5	8		12	
About half	3	10	17	24	
About one-fourth	16	8		12	20
Less than one-fourth	27	10	25	12	20
None or almost none	30	10	33	24	40
(N)	(37)	(48)	(12)	(17)	(5)
% of total number of institutions	53	60	16	24	7

* Table entries are in percentages of institutions requiring specific tests of all (or almost all) applicants for admission (variable N's).

Table 7. Percentage of institutions at which the use of specific tests in admission decisions has changed/is expected to change*

	Since 1970				Between now and 1982			
Test	Increase in use	Little or no change	Decrease in use	(N)	Increase in use	Little or no change	Decrease in use	(N)
ACT	21%	73%	6%	(48)	22%	76%	2%	(50)
SAT	15	71	15	(55)	17	75	7	(53)
TSWE	30	70		(20)	21	79		(24)
ACH's	9	73	18	(22)	20	76	4	(25)
Other	57	43		(7)	38	25	38	(8)

*Table entries are in percentages of those responding to each item (variable N's).

Table 8. Percentage of institutions which accord certain types of students special consideration in admission decisions*

Athletes	27%
Foreign students	31
Handicapped	31
Minorities	51
Non-residents of state	7
Older persons (over 25)	33
Those without high school diplomas	18
Veterans	24
Others	8

*Table entries are in percentages of total number of institutions (N=70).

Table 9. Change in the percentage of institutions according certain students special consideration in admission decisions*

Type of student	Since 1970				Between now and 1982			
	Increase	No change	Decrease	(N)	Increase	No change	Decrease	(N)
Athletes	19%	77%	3%	(31)	7%	87%	7%	(30)
Foreign students	36	61	4	(28)	33	67		(30)
Handicapped	40	60		(30)	53	47		(36)
Minorities	33	60	7	(30)	46	49	5	(41)
Non-residents of state	19	81		(21)	25	75		(24)
Older persons (over 25)	58	42		(31)	56	42	3	(36)
Those without high school diplomas	18	82		(28)	10	86	3	(29)
Veterans	59	41		(29)	16	56	28	(32)
Others	50	50		(6)	29	71		(7)

*Table entries are in percentages of those responding to each item (variable N's).

Table 10. Percentage of institutions which have changed/will change their emphases on various recruiting activities*

Activity	Since 1970				Between now and 1982			
	Greater use	No change	Less use	(N)	Greater use	No change	Less use	(N)
School visitations	66%	24%	10%	(67)	63%	29%	8%	(62)
Participation in college fairs, college nights, etc.	59	33	8	(66)	50	45	5	(62)
Use of faculty	59	38	3	(64)	68	32		(60)
Use of students	50	48	2	(64)	60	40		(62)
Use of alumni	48	51	2	(61)	70	27	2	(63)
Advertising via media	52	42	6	(50)	57	39	4	(51)
Use of commercial marketing firms	5	93	2	(44)	20	78	2	(51)
Major revision of publications	43	41	16	(13)	76	22	2	(59)
Use of search services								
ACT	53	47		(17)	29	71		(21)
CEEB	73	27		(33)	58	42		(38)
National Merit	47	50	3	(34)	53	47		(32)
NSSFNS	42	54	4	(26)	42	58		(26)
Other	50	50		(4)		33	66	(3)

*Table entries are in percentages of those responding to each item (variable N's).

Table 11. Percentage of institutions which make a special effort to recruit certain types of students*

Foreign students	7%
Minorities	51
Occupational groups (law enforcement, nurses, etc.)	20
Older students (over 25)	33
Prisoners	4
Veterans	29
Women in certain fields (e.g., math, engineering)	26
Other	9

*Table entries are in percentages of total number of institutions (N=70).

Table 12. Percentage of institutions which have changed/will change their efforts to recruit certain types of students*

	Since 1970				Between now and 1982			
	Increase	No change	Decrease	(N)	Increase	No change	Decrease	(N)
Foreign students	20%	63%	17%	(30)	18%	82%		(28)
Minorities	74	26		(54)	59	39	2	(51)
Occupational groups (law enforcement, nurses, etc.)	56	44		(32)	52	48		(31)
Older students (over 25)	74	26		(42)	71	29		(42)
Prisoners	12	88		(16)	12	88		(17)
Veterans	76	24		(34)	34	56	9	(32)
Women in certain fields (e.g., math, engineering)	65	35		(31)	59	41		(32)
Others	100			(6)	83	17		(6)

*Table entries are in percentages of those responding to each item (variable N's).

Table 13. Percentage of institutions at which the enrollment situation has prompted/is expected to prompt circular changes to varying extents*

	Great extent	Some extent	Small extent	Not at all
Since 1970	9%	63%	21%	6%
Between now and 1982	23	53	21	3

*Table entries are in percentages of total number of institutions (N=70).

Table 14. Percentage of institutions at which new programs and/or majors have been added/will be added to stimulate enrollment*

	A large number	A moderate number	A few	None	Can't say
Since 1970	4%	43%	40%	13%	
Between now and 1982		38	19	7	35

*Table entries are in percentage of those responding to the question (N=68).

Table 15. Percentage of institutions at which selection procedures have certain characteristics*

Faculty involvement	40%
Student involvement	17
Use of lottery system	
Other	30
Open admission policy	19

*Table entries are in percentages of total number of institutions (N=70).

Table 16. Percentage of institutions at which selection procedures have changed/are expected to change*

	Since 1970				Between now and 1982			
	More important	No change	Less important	(N)	More important	No change	Less important	(N)
Faculty involvement	31%	67%	2%	(42)	41%	56%	2%	(41)
Student involvement	20	80		(30)	29	71		(28)
Use of lottery system	7	93		(14)	8	85	8	(13)
Other	42	58		(19)	24	76		(17)
Open admission policy		100		(17)	13	83	4	(24)

*Table entries are in percentages of those responding to each item (variable N's).

Table 17. Percentage of institutions practicing certain application and notification procedures*

	In 1970	Currently	By 1982
Rolling admissions	64%	71%	71%
Subscription to a common candidate reply date	24	26	27
Early decision offered	31	48	41
Other	6	7	7

*Table entries are in percentages of total number of institutions (N=70).

Table 18. Percentage of institutions which indicate they have changed/will change the application period*

	Earlier opening	No change in opening	(N)	Extended deadline	No change in deadline	(N)
Since 1970	25%	75%	(67)	28%	72%	(67)
Between now and 1982	12	88	(66)	20	80	(64)

*Table entries are in percentages of those responding to each item (variable N's).

Table 19. Percentage of institutions at which placement standards for basic college-level courses have changed/are expected to change*

	Since 1970				Between now and 1982			
	Raised	No change	Lowered	(N)	Raised	No change	Lowered	(N)
In English	48%	46%	7%	(61)	57%	38%	5%	(63)
In mathematics	38	58	3	(65)	44	52	5	(64)

*Table entries are in percentages of those responding to each item (variable N's).

Table 20. Percentage of institutions at which certain factors are important in the placement of students in Freshman English classes*

	Very important	Of some importance	Not used/ unimportant	(N)
High school GPA	13%	38%	48%	(48)
High school English grades	26	38	36	(47)
ACT	22	28	50	(32)
SAT	28	35	38	(40)
TSWE	14	28	59	(29)
ACH/ECT	21	18	61	(28)
Other standardized test	10	1	1	(7)
Local test	50	20	30	(30)

*Table entries are in percentages of those responding to each item (variable N's).

Table 21. Percentage of institutions at which the importance of various factors in the placement of students in Freshman English classes has changed/ is expected to change*

	Since 1970				Between now and 1982			
	More important	No change	Less important	(N)	More important	No change	Less important	(N)
High school GPA	20%	63%	17%	(41)	35%	61%	4%	(46)
High school English grades	27	64	10	(42)	33	63	5	(43)
ACT	37	63		(30)	37	63		(30)
SAT	34	57	9	(35)	28	69	3	(32)
TSWE	40	60		(25)	44	56		(25)
ACH/ECT	14	82	5	(22)	42	54	4	(24)
Other standardized test	30	70		(10)	43	57		(15)
Local test	44	56		(32)	52	48		(29)

*Table entries are in percentages of those responding to each item (variable N's).

Table 22. Percentage of institutions at which certain factors are important in the placement of students in Freshman Math classes*

	Very important	Of some importance	Not used/ unimportant	(N)
High school GPA	16%	44%	40%	(43)
High school math grades	28	51	21	(47)
ACT	34	38	28	(32)
SAT	32	39	28	(38)
ACH/Math	21	28	52	(29)
Other standardized test	82	18		(11)
Local test	46	32	21	(28)

*Table entries are in percentages of those responding to each item (variable N's).

Table 23. Percentage of institutions at which the importance of various factors in the placement of students in Freshman Math classes has changed/is expected to change*

	Since 1970				Between now and 1982			
	More important	No change	Less important	(N)	More important	No change	Less important	(N)
High school GPA	27%	64%	9%	(44)	26%	68%	6%	(47)
High school math grades	31	61	8	(51)	37	59	4	(49)
ACT	32	62	5	(37)	38	62		(37)
SAT	38	58	5	(40)	44	56		(39)
ACH/Math	18	79	4	(28)	31	69		(29)
Other standardized test	30	70		(10)	27	73		(11)
Local test	45	55		(29)	41	52	7	(27)

*Table entries are in percentages of those responding to each item (variable N's).

Table 24. Percentage of institutions at which Freshman Math placement decisions are made by various people*

	In 1970	Currently	By 1982
Students	16%	16%	16%
Counselors	14	14	16
Advisors	21	23	26
Math department	67	79	77

*Table entries are in percentages of total number of institutions (N=70).

Table 25. Percentage of institutions at which Freshman English placement decisions are made by various people*

	In 1970	Currently	By 1982
Students	11%	9%	7%
Counselors	9	9	9
Advisors	20	22	24
English department	58	78	73

*Table entries are in percentages of those institutions indicating that they currently have a Freshman English requirement (N=55).

Table 26. Percentage of institutions at which a test of writing ability is required for the purposes of making English placement decisions*

In 1970	Currently	By 1982
29%	55%	58%

*Table entries are in percentages of those institutions indicating that they currently have a Freshman English requirement (N=55).

Table 27. Percentage of institutions at which different kinds of tests of writing ability are required*

	In 1970	Currently	By 1982
Writing test	22%	33%	21%
Objective test	17	17	15
Combination	61	50	65
(N)	(18)	(30)	(34)

*Table entries are in percentages of those responding to each item (variable N's).

Table 28. Percentage of institutions for whom required test results are utilized in placement decisions*

All or almost all applicants	33%
More than three-fourths	2
About three-fourths	10
About half	25
About one-fourth	6
Less than one-fourth	18
None to almost none	6

*Table entries are in percentages of those indicating that tests are required of all, or almost all, applicants for admission (N=51).

Table 29. Percentage of institutions using statewide testing program results*

	In 1970			Currently			By 1982		
	Used	Not received/ not used	(N)	Used	Not received/ not used	(N)	Will use	Won't receive/ won't use	(N)
In admission decisions	4%	96%	(53)	5%	95%	(64)	7%	93%	(57)
In placement decisions	6	94	(49)	3	97	(62)	7	93	(54)

*Table entries are in percentages of those responding to each item (variable N's).